THE PERPETUAL SEARCH FOR A HOME

Voluntary Homelessness Amongst Highly Mobile Elites

Matilda Ajanko

University of Helsinki
Faculty of Social Sciences
Social and Cultural Anthropology
Master's Thesis
November 2020

HELSINGIN YLIOPISTO
HELSINGFORS UNIVERSITET
UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

Tiedekunta/Osasto – Fakultet/Sektion – Faculty Faculty of Social Sciences	Laitos – Institution – Department Department of Social Research	
Tekijä □– Författare – Author Ajanko, Matilda		
Työn nimi – Arbetets titel – Title The Perpetual Search for a Home: Voluntary Homelessness Amongst Highly Mobile Elites		
Oppiaine – Läroämne – Subject Social and Cultural Anthropology		
Työn laji – Arbetets art – Level Master's Thesis	Aika – Datum – Month and year November 2016	Sivumäärä – Sidoantal – Number of pages 84

Tiivistelmä – Referat – Abstract

This partly autoethnographical study of homelessness within highly mobile people asks if the meaning of home changes and how it changes when people do not have a fixed point of dwelling. It aims to shed light onto the question of space and place within social studies. This thesis combines personal narrative with semi-structured interviews in order to provide better understanding of the seemingly simple concept of 'home'. The fieldwork was conducted in multiple locations around the world, following the mobile lifestyles of people working within the yachting industry. As the thesis focuses on the lifestyles of elites, it provides a different perspective to homelessness as the studies that focus on forced homelessness do.

The 'spatial turn', which started in the late 1980's, has changed the perception of space and place not only within anthropology but in other fields of academia as well. This thesis looks at how this theoretical approach has affected the way that space and place is reflected in everyday life. Utilising discourses from mobility and transnationalism studies, the aim is not to present highly mobile people as disconnected from place but, instead, to show how place and space are still meaningful. The analysis of different spatial perspectives concentrates on three different aspects: home as a dwelling place, home as a community and home as a nation. Through these approaches, the thesis makes the concept of home easier to understand.

Another important element that this thesis reveals is how anthropologists should not forget the temporal aspect of life while putting more emphasis on spatiality. The thesis argues that only by combining these two elements, we can fully comprehend the implications of mobile lifestyle. Without the temporal aspect, the understanding of homelessness remains partial. Drawing from previous ethnographic studies of lifestyle migration, this thesis contributes to the discourse of rootedness and the implications of leaving one's homeland. Identity and nomadic lifestyle are in a constant dialogue with each other, affecting the life trajectories of the "elite homeless". This thesis looks at how time changes its shape, when life consists of short periods of time in multiple different locations. The interview material amplifies the paradox of the need for a permanent home and the urge to keep travelling. The thesis aims to show how once uprooted, the ability to relocate and return to location bound lifestyle becomes problematic.

This thesis also aspires to show how autoethnography can be a useful tool for anthropologists. The writer's personal experiences act as the structure around which other ethnographic material and the theory build on. As autoethnography is not widely used method in anthropology, the thesis looks into the history and two main branches of autoethnography.

Avainsanat – Nyckelord – Keywords
Homelessness, mobility, elites, autoethnography, place, space, identity

HELSINGIN YLIOPISTO
HELSINGFORS UNIVERSITET
UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

Tiedekunta/Osasto – Fakultet/Sektion – Faculty	Laitos – Institution – Department
Valitotieteellinen tiedekunta	Sosiaalitieteiden laitos

Tekijä □– Författare – Author
Ajanko, Matilda

Työn nimi – Arbetets titel – Title
The Perpetual Search for a Home: Voluntary Homelessness Amongst Highly Mobile Elites

Oppiaine – Läroämne – Subject
Sosiaali- ja kulttuuriantropologia

Työn laji – Arbetets art – Level	Aika – Datum – Month and year	Sivumäärä – Sidoantal – Number of pages
pro gradu -tutkielma	marraskuu 2020	84

Tiivistelmä – Referat – Abstract

Tämä osittain autoethnografinen pro gradu -tutkielma kodittomuudesta liikkuvien eliittien keskuudessa kysyy, muuttuuko käsitys kodista ja miten se muuttuu, silloin kun ihmisillä ei ole pysyvää asuntoa. Tutkielman tarkoituksena on valottaa, miten paikan ja tilan käsitteet ovat muuttuneet sosiaalitieteissä. Tutkielma yhdistää henkilökohtaista narratiivia ja temaattisia haastatteluja, tarjotakseen paremman ymmärryksen yksinkertaiselta vaikuttavasta kodin käsitteestä. Kenttätyö toteutettiin eri paikoissa ympäri maailmaa, seuraten purjehdusalalla työskentelevien ihmisten elämäntyyliä. Koska tutkielma perustuu eliittien kodittomuuteen, tarjoaa se erilaisen näkökulman, kuin kodittomiksi pakotettujen ihmisten elämään keskittyvät tutkimukset.

'Spatial turn', joka alkoi 1980-luvun loppu puolella, on muuttanut käsityksen paikasta ja tilasta niin antropologiassa kuin muiden tieteenalojen keskuudessa. Tämä tutkimus selvittää, miten muutos teoreettisessa lähestymistavassa on vaikuttanut ymmärrykseen paikasta ja tilasta jokapäiväisessä elämässä. Hyödyntämällä aikaisempaa tutkimusta liikkuvuudesta, työn tarkoituksena ei ole esittää liikkuvia eliittejä paikasta ja tilasta riippumattomina, mutta osoittaa kuinka niillä on edelleen merkitystä ihmisten elämässä. Tutkimus, jakaa kodin tilan kolmeen osaan: koti asuinpaikkana, koti yhteisönä ja koti kansana. Näiden kolmen lähestymistavan avulla, kodin käsite on helpompi ymmärtää.

Toinen tärkeä näkökulma, jonka tutkielma tuo esille on, että antropologien ei tulisi unohtaa ajan merkitystä silloinkaan, kun teorian päähuomio on tilan merkityksessä. Tutkielma väittää, että ainoastaan yhdistämällä nämä kaksi eri näkökulmaa, pystymme ymmärtämään liikkuvan elämäntyylin merkityksen kokonaisuudessaan. Ilman ajallista näkökulmaa kodin käsite jää puolittaiseksi. Tutkimus selvittää, miten ajan käsitys muuttuu, kun elämä pirstaloituu lyhyiksi ajan jaksoiksi lukuisiin eri paikkoihin. Hyödyntämällä aikaisempaa tutkimuskirjallisuutta, joka käsittelee siirtolaisuutta, tutkimus osallistuu keskusteluun juurettomuudesta sekä kotimaasta lähdön vaikutuksista.

Identiteetti ja nomadielämäntapa ovat jatkuvassa dialogissa keskenään, vaikuttaen liikkuvien eliittien elämänkulkuun. Haastattelumateriaali tuo esille sen paradoksin, mikä kodittomien eliittien elämässä on usein läsnä: he kaipaavat pysyvää kotia, mutta paikalleen jääminen tuntuu vaikealta sen jälkeen, kun ihminen on jättänyt kotimaansa pysyvästi.

Tämän pro gradu -tutkielman tarkoituksena on myös osoittaa, miten autoetnografiaa voidaan hyödyntää metodologisena keinona antropologisessa tutkimuksessa. Kirjoittajan henkilökohtaiset kokemukset toimivat perustana, jonka päälle teoria ja muu kenttätyömateriaali rakentuu. Koska autoetnografia ei ole kovin yleinen käytäntö antropologiassa, esittelee tutkimus autoetnografian historiaa sekä kaksi pääsuuntausta.

Avainsanat – Nyckelord – Keywords
Kodittomuus, liikkuvuus, eliitit, autoethnografia, paikka, tila, identiteetti

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

The paradox of home is that, often, only once we have been displaced or become transient, we achieve the ultimate sense of belonging (Dawson & Rapport 1988: 9). Before starting my career as a professional sailor, I had never really thought about what home means to me. It was not until I became homeless, when the concept of home started to interest me. Lisa Malkki (1992: 24) writes that to have a home, to be rooted is a basic human need. At first glance, this statement makes sense and is often taken for granted. However, after years of not having a home and not spending longer than a few months at a time in a single country and sharing this lifestyle with hundreds of others, I started to question this platitude. What do we actually mean when we talk about home? What does “being rooted” encompass?

What constitutes as a home is anything but clear; it is filled with ambiguities and contradictions. “Where is my home?”, is a question that especially highly mobile people keep asking themselves (Rollins 2011: 121). Normally the expectation is that the answer is a specific location. At the same time phrases “being home” or “going home” are associated with a feeling of comfort, familiarity and relaxation (Scott 2009: 49). Thus, home is a physical place, a mindset, a community and a feeling of belonging. It is the way we exist in the world. Being home is knowing one’s place and feeling secure and safe (Dovey 1984: 36). Home is also a mode of activity, not a bounded entity (Jackson 1995: 149). Against this background the statement “to have a home is a basic need”, is not as simple as it first seems.

Home is arguably a personal concept, and homemaking is an active project that combines concrete physicality of a dwelling place with the nostalgia of past home(s) and the imagining of the future one(s) (Ahmed et al. 2003: 9). Home, opposed to a house, is much more than a physical place. However, it is difficult to claim that home is purely an idea either. Instead, it always has a distinctive spatial attachment that is built on “locales” (Boccogni 2015: 8, 12). “In my understanding, home can be reframed as a meaningful relationship with place,

hence as a situated and interactive endeavour, rather than as a physical structure out there – without neglecting the significance of the latter as a potential repository of distinctive meanings, emotions and functions." (Boccagni 2016: 2). In other words, home is more of an epistemological than ontological question (Cresswell 2014: 174).

What home means to one person is different than what it means to another. Whereas a house can be studied as a discrete variable, a home does not have this quality. A home only exists in relation to personal experiences and can be conceived as a special relationship between people and their environment (Dovey 1984: 34). However, this does not mean that home as a concept is something that cannot be defined or cannot be studied. The first question in my interviews was: "How do you describe home?". The answers varied, but the personal connection was mentioned in all of them.

"Home for me is a place that you love, a place where you have people that you love and somewhere where you are happy to invest your time and money. I casually use the word 'home' to describe my current place of residence, however I believe the word has more of an emotional attachment than just physical". (Courtney, 29)

" --- definitely not, this is not a home, not my home at least. For me home has to be more personal. Home is the place where I will make my own family". (Elsa, 34)

"I consider Maine to be home, but when I travel abroad, I quickly start to gain an affinity and connection to a place, making me rarely miss my true home. I think this is indicative that home extends far beyond a physical place protected by walls to encompass the familiarity I feel with a city and the closeness I feel to others who co-habitat in that place." (Nikki, 25)

As the examples above demonstrate, a simple question, one that we often take for granted, resulted in a myriad of answers. The notion of home is influenced by our personal histories and experiences. However, even though a home is a personal concept, we must avoid the pitfall of calling every single place where we feel happy and comfortable in a "home". Familiarity is central for the idea of belonging, but it is not enough on its own (Bagnall et al. 2004: 57). If every place that we feel a connection to, is home, the term loses its particularity. Unlike some sociologists have suggested, (see Delanty 2003) I do not believe that a sense of community, and thus a sense of home, can be created in places like airports, train stations or shopping malls; places that Augé (1992) calls none-places. It is not the frequency of how often a person passes through a place that makes it home. Nowicka (2006: 147) writes that the feeling of home is about having objects and people that are familiar around you, hence even a hotel room can feel like home. The problem here is that Nowicka confuses feelings of familiarity and comfort with home. Home needs to be those things too, but I do not agree that they are enough on their own. With Nowicka's logic, my sister's home would be my home, as well as my best friend's or my grandparents'. I have spent extensive periods of time in all those places and I recognise the objects around me. When I stay in those places, I have people that I am close with around, I have even created memories in those places. But still, I would not say that any of those places are *my* home. Same goes with hotels, airports and other places through which I transit often. During my busiest travelling times, I pass through different airports countless times. I am at Heathrow airport sometimes four times a week, so I know the place well: I know where the best seats are if I need quiet time, I know which coffee shop to go to for the best coffee and a croissant, I am familiar with all the procedures of check-in, security and boarding. However, not ever have I even imagined calling the airport my home or have had a sense of belonging or communality towards these places, nor have I ever heard anyone talking about such places in a sense of belonging. There might be a feeling of familiarity and recognition but that is very different from a feeling of belonging. Hence, we have to be careful not to equate home with every place where we feel happy or comfortable.

The aim of this thesis is to demonstrate, how the concept of home is tied to our identity, location, mobility, nationality and sense of community and belonging. My main research question is: what do we mean by home, and how the concept of home has changed as our understanding of place and space has changed? More specifically, I am interested in how highly mobile people, who have voluntarily chosen homelessness, perceive home and how the theories of mobility and transnationalism change the discourse around home and belonging. Through my own experiences, conversations I have had over the years, and the interviews I conducted over the past months, I aim to show how the ostensibly simple concept of home is composed of opposing ideas, is laden with normative assumptions, and how it reflects our very existence in the world.

The lens through which I am looking at homes and homemaking is privileged. As my research group, I will be using the homogeneous group of people who work in the yachting industry. Since, most of them work on sailing boats, but not all, I cannot use the term “sailor” to describe them. Instead, I will be using the word “yachtie” that refers to anyone working in the yachting industry. I will give a more detailed description in chapter four. My main interest is the aspects of homemaking from the point of view of elite homelessness. By “elite homeless” I refer to individuals who have voluntarily chosen not to reside anywhere permanently. Their homelessness is not driven by financial factors or by threats imposed to them in their home countries but, instead, it is a lifestyle choice. This type of homelessness is a vastly different experience than the experience of those who are forced into homelessness or live in exile. It differs from those who have left voluntarily but find themselves in precarious situations due to immigration politics or economic factors. It also differs from the perspective of those who have a home, but that home is a scene of violence and abuse. As Rosie Cox and Victor Buchli (2017: xii) write: “Home is both physical and metaphorical, local and national, a place of belonging and of exclusion”. Home is not only a place of harmony and happiness. It can also be a place of violence, domination and exclusion. The difference between the idealistic ideas of ‘home’ and the actual lived lives that happen in homes is, according to Dovey (1984: 46-

47), a dialectic relationship between yearning-for-home and being-at-home. These two approaches represent different experiences of what falls under the immense concept of ‘home’. Despite the obvious differences between mobile elites and forced migration, there are multiple conjunctions and parallels between the different groups and situations, and hence, I will draw from those studies as well.

I will start off by introducing the main theoretical questions about place versus space and mobility. I will look more closely into Law and Mol’s article from 1994 called Regions, Networks and Fluids: Anaemia and Social Topology, in which they introduce a different theoretical way of approaching human connections, opposed to the over simplistic way of understanding place and space. After the theory chapter I will briefly explain my methodological approach and how I understand the term autoethnography before moving onto the field. My main analysis chapters are divided into three. The first one is about homelessness and what kind of ramifications it has to identity and feeling of belonging. In the second one I will examine different spatial elements of home which are: dwelling place, community and nation. The last analytical chapter, before conclusion, will look into the temporal aspect of home.

2 From local communities to transnational fluidities

2.1 Previous research

German philosopher Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) is arguably one of most influential modern philosophers who has affected our perception of “being in the world”. His work on home, homelessness and homecoming is often quoted and used as a theoretical starting point, not only in the field of philosophy, but in other human sciences as well. Since Heidegger, the question of home has been taken up by scholars from multiple different fields. Anthropological and sociological studies of home have been influenced by architecture, urban studies, psychology,

philosophy and human geography, to name a few, and in return, anthropology has given a lot of insights to other fields regarding home and homelessness.

As a starting point for this thesis, I will use two big theoretical discourses: place versus space and mobility/transnationalism. Both of these themes started to attract more attention in the late 1980's. This increased interest led in social sciences and humanities to a 'spatial turn' that puts emphasis on place and space instead of time and history (Nowicka 2006: 21). According to the theorists that advocated for the 'spatial turn', social relations are primarily organised in space (Urry 2007: 34). For example, identity is not only anchored in history and in generational differences but is an interplay between space and time (Dawson & Rapport 1998: 3). The idea that space and place are meaningful is by no means new or novel to human sciences. In fact, already in the 1500's, the character of space was of interest to humanists, and the debate whether space is socially constructed or immutable, has its roots in seventeenth-century natural philosophy (Kümin & Usborne 2013: 307). It is fair to say that space has always been the central organising principle in social sciences (Gupta & Ferguson 1992: 7). However, the main interest of social sciences revolved around human agency and time, up until the late 1980's when finally, the interest in place and space started to increase significantly (Kümin & Usborne 2013: 307, 309). Arjun Appadurai, Ulf Hannerz, and Michelle Rosaldo were amongst the earliest anthropologists who started to pay attention to how place and location were taken for granted and how this affected our understanding of culture and belonging (Ferguson & Gupta 1992: 6). When earlier theorists saw space something that was given, something that formed a backdrop to all human action but could not be altered or changed, the researchers who contributed to the 'spatial turn' pointed out that space is just as dynamic and constructed as time (Kümin & Usborne 2013: 307). In the past thirty years, Ferguson and Gupta have both written extensively on the topic of how we can no longer perceive culture as something that is grounded in a bounded location and have become prominent anthropologists in the field of space and location. Since the focus has moved away from bounded cultures, identity formation has become more central to

anthropological discourses and thus, this will be one of my main arguments when it comes to the idea of home. Identities cannot be conflated with culture and location but, instead, identities are more and more de-territorialised (Arias & Warf 2008: 6; Escobar 2001: 146). The critique of place and space is not, of course, only reserved to anthropologists but has similarly interested other scholars. Especially in human geography, space and place are understandably very central themes. One of the most prominent figures that has contributed for the 'spatial turn' from the geographical tradition is Edward Soja, whose main critique was towards the subordination of space to time and social structure. According to Soja, time, space and social structure are all equally important founding parts of social theory (Arias & Warf 2008: 3-4). It is also important to note the contribution of feminist theorists such as Doreen Massey and bell hooks, who both have contributed significantly to the theories of space.

The late 1980's also saw the beginning of proliferation of theories that emphasise mobility, fluidity, transnationalism, globalisation, nomadism. One example of this is John Urry's mobility paradigm, which attempts to establish a "movement-driven social science" (Urry 2007: 18). Other dominant writers on the topic are Zygmund Bauman and his concept of liquidity, Ulrich Beck who talks about reflexive modernity and Manuel Castells with his 'space of flows'. Of course, these are just the few of the best-known names and in addition there are multiple writers in different fields, who discuss this topic. Despite the different terms used, all of these theories turn our gaze away from localised cultures and, instead, present the world as liquid or fluid flows of people, goods, capital, ideas and identities. However, this does not mean places and spaces have become irrelevant. On the contrary, the results of globalisation have only accentuated the importance of them (Arias & Warf 2008: 5).

There is also a lot of research done on migrants and diaspora communities that is related to home-building. The contemporary ethnographers of transnationalism mainly focus on migration from poorer countries or communities to more affluent ones and on their struggles to rebuild their lives in an environment where they

are often politically and economically disadvantaged. This is not to say that there are not any studies done of mobile elites. In the end, I was able to find numerous books, articles and papers that focus on how those, who have willingly chosen to become homeless, perceive the concept of “home”. Despite the vast interest of different fields, empirical research on the personal constructions of home is still relatively undeveloped (Boccagni 2016: 7; Nowica 2007: 70). By studying a group of people who do not migrate from A to B nor have a strong sense of belonging to any single place, I hope that I can contribute to the research done on homes. The lifestyle of professional sailors and yachties is still an atypical one but can provide us with insights of the direction the world is moving towards; a world where a person’s connection to location is no longer the primary method of identification and where rights and obligations are no longer tied to nation-state citizenship. If and when this kind of a world becomes a reality, is uncertain, however, the recent developments are pointing towards a more mobile and fluid world.

In the next two chapters, I draw the outlines of the theoretical background onto which I will build my own findings. Since both, the discourse on place/space dichotomy and the theories around mobility and transnationalism are so vast, I can merely scratch the surface of them. There is a huge amount of material that is related to these topics, so I have chosen only the ones that are directly connected to the topic of home and homelessness.

2.2 Place versus Space

In order to understand the different layers and meanings of ‘home’ we need to have a basic understanding of how place and space have been conceptualised in social and human sciences. The ubiquity and the mixing of vernacular with analytical conceptualisations of the terms place and space, makes them difficult concepts to grasp (Cresswell 2014: 7). Generally, place is associated with geographical location, community and locality, whereas, space is equated with mobility, fluidity and dissolvement of boundaries (Escobar 2001: 143; Nowicka

2006: 52). Space is something abstract; “a realm without meaning”, whereas place is a space which people have named and are connected to (Cresswell 2014: 16). In other words, place is often presented as a location in space (Kabachnik 2012: 214). A similar approach is taken in the local/global rhetoric: location is conflated with empirical and concrete, whereas global with abstract (Moore 2004: 75). Thus, we can say that local is within the sphere of place and global is a “space”. This division can also be made by dividing space into conceptual space and lived space (Dovey 1984: 35) or by categorising places as places and non-places (Auge 1992). According to Dovey (1984: 35) conceptual space is the “ether” in which people, places and things exist, whereas the lived space is the preconceptual and meaningful spatial experience. As for Augé (1995), his critique was aimed towards how globalisation generates places that are ahistorical and impersonal, such as airports and shopping malls. Augé (1995: 85-86) does not conflate space with non-place but instead discusses how there are spaces that we personally create but also places, that no matter how often frequented, remain as impersonal. So, it is way too simplistic to argue that space is an abstract “realm without meaning” and place is a physical, immobile location (Kabachnik 2012: 214). If we only see places as subjective and material “real places” that are *conceived* and space as a purely mental and imagined ether that we *perceive*, an important aspect is missed. (Creswell 2014: 69-70). Instead, space is just as much a socially and culturally created concept that is in constant state of change (Nowica 2007: 73), as place is, and places are not necessarily fixed in location (Kabachnik 2012: 214).

The idea of ‘home’ is a good example of how this simplistic division does not work. If we examine this dualistic view from the perspective of home, its flaws become apparent. Home is arguably both a space and place. It is easy to agree that home as a place is actively constructed, and homemaking is a particular way of place-making (Boccagni 2015: 12). However, if we do not think of home only as a physical place that exists in one location but also as a feeling, identity and mentality, the claim that space is an “empty realm without meaning”, becomes invalid. Clearly space is something that is actively created by individuals and

communities. It is not “an ether” that we only perceive but do not influence. Instead, space and place should be conceived as repeatedly entangled and integrated terms and concepts (Kabachnik 2012: 215). As Bagnall et al. (2004: 22) write: “Belonging should be seen neither in existential terms (as primordial attachment to some kind of face-to-face community), nor as discursively constructed, but as socially constructed embedded process in which people reflexively judge the suitability of a given site as appropriate given their social trajectory and their position in other fields”.

The idea that place is a location in space also implicitly assumes that there is a hierarchical relationship between place and space. According to this approach, space exists regardless of human action, whereas places are created. Thus, place is a derivative of space. This notion then, in return, questions the relationship between place and a physical location. To avoid this confusion of the relationship between space and place, it is much more fruitful to understand them as interconnected but not hierarchical concepts (Kabachnik 2012: 216). What is interesting is the academic prioritisation of space over place since, at the end of the day, it is our ontological immersion in place rather than space that frames our everyday lives. As much as we try and argue against the importance of place, we cannot escape the fact that the actual, lived human lives always happen in places/locations (Escobar 2001: 143).

To fill the gap between place and space, home can be understood as a “thirdspace” that is practiced and lived, never established but always produced and producing (Cresswell 2014: 69-70). Thirdspace is a concept formulated by Edward Soja, whose work was influenced by Henri Lefebvre. Its central argument is to criticise the dualistic essence of spatialisation (Castree et al. 2013). Thirdspace opens up the debate around space and place and how categories that are too strict limit, instead of widen our understanding. This new approach to space and place is not an indication that the way the world works has profoundly changed but that the idea of culturally bounded place has always been purely an ideology and/or a useful research practice (Dawson & Rapport 1998: 4-5).

Through the concept of home, we can examine place attachment in a more general sense since, in a way, ‘home’ is the ultimate location. Or as Cresswell (2014: 173) calls it “the ideal place”.

2.3 Regions, networks and fluidities

Despite the merits of Soja’s “thirdspace”, I will not look into it more deeply but, instead, use Law and Mol’s theory of social topologies as my main theoretical frame on spatialisation. The theory was first presented by Law and Mol’s in an article called “Regions, Networks and Fluids: Anaemia and Social Topology” (1994). Law and Mol start their essay by describing a person at a health workers office with clear symptoms of anaemia. They ask: “Now where is her anaemia?” (1994: 641). Through the metaphors of blood and anaemia they demonstrate that there are three different ways to spatially organise the ‘social’. Law and Mol call these topologies.

The first topology is the one that we understand the easiest: regions. We often see the world as regions where things are clustered together, and boundaries are drawn around each cluster. The topology of regions is to homogenise different areas. It is to suppress and forget variations inside regions and instead focus on the variations between them (Law & Mol 1994: 643, 646-647). This has been the typical way to organise the social. In other words, this is what we normally call places. They are tightly bound and fixed, with clear ideas who is allowed to come in and who should stay out (Kabachnik 2012: 213). When I say, “home is Finland”, it is a reference to my (national) identity, to my past, but most of all, it is a reference to a geographical location. A location that has clear boundaries and is something concrete and physical in its geographical sense. There is no ambiguity to it. Same applies when I bought a house in Spain and started calling it my home. I did not need to explain why Spain was suddenly “home” even though I am not Spanish, and I have no personal history in the country. Just the fact that I had bought an apartment, a place that I could control, was enough for it to constitute as a home. Home as a region does not limit to a nation. Instead, I see the analogy

of home as a region as concentric circles that on a smallest level is a physical dwelling place, such as an apartment, house, or perhaps a caravan and on the largest level can refer to a nation or even a continent. They are regions people create for themselves, and others see us as a part of. They collect and gather meaningful objects and people and place them within the borders of their 'home'. Things that do not matter are shut out and things that do matter are let in. The questions we ask about home, reveal that this is the way 'home' is most commonly referred to. We do not ask *how* or *who* or *what* is your home but, instead, *where* is your home (Nowicka 2006: 138).

In order to have regions, we need to have networks, which is the second of Law and Mol's topologies. Regions do not exist on their own, they only exist in relation to another. Through networks we acquire the parameters around which to build regions. Networks also generate regions by crossing boundaries and spreading themselves. Law and Mol follow Bruno Latour's theory of immutable mobiles. Immutable mobile is an entity that moves across borders but stays the same no matter where it moves. Its elements do not change and the relationship between them is not altered (Law & Mol 1994: 649). Understood this way, home is still a place but as we know, people can have multiple homes. I can have a sense of belonging in multiple locations. My homes in different countries are very different in their size, location and appearance but it is the immutable feeling of "being home" that I have, and my physical existence in those places, that connects them together as my network of homes. In the topology of regions physical proximity of things is essential. We cannot draw boundaries around things that are scattered. In a network space, proximity is not physical. Instead "places with a similar set of elements and similar relations between them are close to one another, and those with different elements or relations are far apart" (Law & Mol 1994: 649). Thus, agents in networks form specific nodes that connect with each other on a space-time continuum and 'fold' regional surfaces. Simply put: "The network brings together two or more locations that are far away from each other on a regional map" (Law & Mol 1994: 650). My home in Palma and my home in

Helsinki, on the surface, have nothing in common, however, they form a part of my home network.

But not all social stays within the boundaries of regions nor does it travel around or exists unchanged everywhere in the world. This brings us to Law and Mol's last topology: fluids. According to them: "We are looking at variation without boundaries and transformation without discontinuity" and later: "The study of fluids, then, will be a study of the relations, repulsions and attractions which form a flow. Repulsions which sometimes, to be sure, mean that a fluid encounters its limits" There are four characteristics that separate fluidity from regions and networks. The first of them is boundaries. Fluid spaces are not determined by sharp boundaries. Not within the space or in relation to others. Variation is gradient instead of determined by clear cut-off points. I will quote Law and Mol again to emphasise this point since this is essential for my argument that I will be making later about homes.

"In a fluid space it's not possible to determine identifies nice and neatly, once and for all. Or to distinguish inside from outside, this place from somewhere else. Similarity and difference aren't like identity and non-identity. They come, as it were, in varying shades and colours. They go together" (Law & Mol 1994: 664).

The second characteristic that makes fluid spaces unique is their capability to create mixtures. Unlike in networks, where the elements need to be immutable in order for them to work as they are meant to, in fluid spaces, elements are malleable, and they can be mixed or separated without collapsing the space. Which brings us to the third point: robustness. They persist because they do not have clear boundaries that need to be defended, or adding, mixing or extracting elements do not change their essence. The fourth and last point that Law and Mol make is the intricacy of relations between the three different topologies. They are not suggesting that fluidity takes over from the two other forms or it is

somehow more desirable. All three have a purpose in our attempts to conceptualise social space. They write:

“So fluid spaces are no ‘better’ than regions or networks. They are no more attractive. Or virtuous. And they don’t ‘really’ get at the chaos. For the social doesn’t simply organize itself into a liquid form – not even in a fluid space. Fluid objects absorb all kinds of elements that could only ever have come into being within the logic of other topologies” (Law & Mol 1994: 663).

So, if homes can be regions and networks, how are they also fluid spaces? Home is a fluidity because its essence does not dissipate even when it is contested, mixed and lost. We refer to home as a dwelling place, as a community and as a nationality. Home is a place and a space, and it is an integral part of our identity. It is a simple and concrete entity but at the same time a metaphor for our dreams and hopes. Throughout this thesis, my aim is to show how the concept of home moves between these three topologies and a simple question of “what is home” becomes not so simple.

2.4 Mobility and Transnationalism

In earlier sociology the idea of fluidity and mobility was associated with social movement between classes. A fluid society was seen as a society without barriers where people could move vertically between socio-economic classes. The current debate has evolved from simple up-down mobility, to a term that encompasses both horizontal and vertical movement. Overall, the idea of mobility is much more complex and far-reaching than what the earlier debates compressed it to be (Kaufmann 2003: 4; Urry 2007: 8). In today’s world, mobility in itself, as long as it is voluntary, has become a sign of privilege and affluence. (Jansson 2016: 421).

As Stephen Castles, who has done extensive research on citizenship and migration, argues "*flows* are replacing *places* as the key loci of economic and social organization" (Castles 2017: 348). Placelessness has become a determining factor of postmodernity (Escobar 2001: 140). However, seeing the world through the lens of mobility does not mean that places are no longer important. The world is not an endless horizon of flows and networks, nor are places isolated, autonomous entities but instead, the world consists of interconnected and fluid places and spaces (Kabachnik 2012: 214). This mobility and fluidity are not only about physical movement but about imagination and the possibility of it (Dawson & Rapport 1998: 4).

There is nothing new about the movement of people; people have always moved around and travelled throughout human history. But what is new, is the scale and diversity of different mobility systems (Urry 2007: 195). The amount of people, who have migrated, has never been as high as it currently is (Nail 2015: 1). According to Castles (2017: 338), the proliferation of transnational communities has been made possible by the technological improvements in transportation, and in real-life electronic communication. These technological advancements have played a key role in enabling the change, but they can only partly explain the shift towards a more globally organised world. Castles argues that "globalization is closely linked to changes in social structures and relationships, and to shifts in cultural values concerned with place, mobility, and belonging". Despite the fact that in the beginning of the century, there were more migrants than ever before still, in reality, the majority of the people never leave their homelands or abandon their location-bound lifestyle. Adreotti et al. (45: 2012) note that, even though the number has been slowly increasing, only 1.5 to 2 percent of Europeans annually move to another country. Kauffman (2013: 12), on the other hand, points out that the number of journeys per person per day has stayed stagnant since the recording began in the 1950's, and Urry (2007: 4) writes that people do not spend more time travelling in their day to day lives than before. There is arguably a shift from local travel to international travel, alongside with the rapid increase in telecommunication as well as speed and volume of

information circulation. However, has this led to a world where “everyone is constantly on the move”, is under debate. “More than growth, it seems that we are dealing with substitution phenomena between forms of mobility and circulation.”, writes Kaufmann (2003: 12).

To what extent globalisation has changed societies, is not something that is agreed on either. According to Kaufman (2003: 3), due to the technical advances in transportation and telecommunications, the time-space continuum has been compressed, and this compression has had a profound impact on social life. Dawson and Rapport (1998: 3) argue that the traditional way of seeing individuals as members of fixed and location-bound societies and cultures, has become redundant. However, Bude and Dürrschmidt (2010: 488) do not agree with these sentiments. They write: “Even when we put into brackets the vertical or social stratification of global society and culture, the horizontal view also suggests that the ‘deterritorialization’ thesis overplays the immateriality of global space and the technical annulment of spatial distance, while underplaying the socio-cultural thickness of territoriality”. Through globalisation, movement and non-places have become increasingly important for modern identity formation, which in turn only heightens the importance of places we do not only pass through but spend longer periods of time in (Escobar 2001: 147). Urry (2007: 227) also reminds us that physical propinquity does not necessarily correlate with emotional closeness in a world where “catching up” can be done over the phone or internet. However, virtual presence does not substitute physical presence. Meeting face-to-face is still required in order to maintain long-term emotional connections, as well as a place or an event still needs to be experienced in real life (Jansson 2016: 427; Urry 2007: 37). Technical reach or connectivity cannot replace territoriality, not even within global culture (Bude & Dürrschmidt 2010: 489). In a similar vein, a home needs to be experienced on a physical level and nomadic people are connected to places as much as sedentary people. Even those whose careers put them in the group of the “global mobile elite”, do not see themselves uprooted and detached from location (Adreotti et al. 2012). Globalisation does not mean

the death of local, nor are sedentary people any less global than highly mobile ones.

My intention is not to discredit mobility theories or to argue against the need for a more complex understanding of globalisation or mobility, however, these theories often ignore the importance of belonging. The over accentuation of globalism in our everyday life has impoverished our understanding of "thickness" of human life (Bude & Dürrschmidt 2010: 482). My attempt is to demonstrate that even highly mobile people, who out of their own choice do not permanently reside anywhere, still long for the feeling of belonging. I also argue that a shapeshifting, diverse, and loosely formed transnational community, can only partially work as a ground where one can root oneself and get a sense of belonging. A key point in understanding how highly mobile people situate themselves on a local-global axis, is that globalisation does not erode the importance of place but instead re-constructs localism through new forms of connection and mobility. To understand local, we have to observe it through the lens of global relationships instead of seeing local to be transcended by globalisation (Bagnall et al. 2004: 15). Through my examples I hope to demonstrate that places and locations have not lost their meaning in a globalised world. Following Law and Mol's theory of different topologies, combined with my own research on concepts of home and homelessness amongst the highly mobile yachties, I hope to contribute to the discussion on place attachment and mobility.

3 Research methods

When I first started to compose ideas for my thesis, my intention was not to write an autoethnography. I had decided to use the sailing community as my starting point, however, as autoethnography is not something that had been discussed in methodology courses, I did not think of this as a possibility at first. As my topic started to take form, I realised how much of it was based on my own experiences. The idea for my topic was not something that I "came up with". Instead, it was a topic that was constantly present in my life and in conversations I had with friends

that shared my lifestyle. “Once freed of the notion of a “field” as a spatialized site of research, could an anthropologist investigate the shifting locations of her or his own life? Could “homework” be autobiography?” asked Clifford in 1997 (88). Encouraged by this idea, I started to look more into autoethnography and how could I utilise my own experiences in this thesis.

3.1 Autoethnography as a method

Autoethnography as a method used in social sciences is reasonably young and it still remains an anomaly amongst anthropological writing (Chang et al. 2012: 21). It wasn’t until the mid 1970’s when the term “autoethnography” started to appear in academic writings (Adams et al. 2015: 16). When the term was first used by Karl Heider and David Hayano, the meaning they gave to the term was considerably different from the way it is used today. For Heider and Hayano autoethnography was not a way to challenge and criticise the existing traditions of conventional ethnography. The reason for this was that the call to researcher reflexivity or the concerns about silent authorship, were not topical at the time (Bochner & Ellis 2016: 47). Surprisingly, not even in anthropology which has, during its whole existence, struggled to justify its methods and its intrinsic premise of studying the “other”. However, Hayano, as an anthropologist, saw the inevitability of anthropological research moving away from colonial practises and towards cultures that were closer to ‘home’ (Anderson 2006: 376). In the end, it was the identity politics that gave a real nudge to more open criticism of research methods (Adams et al 2015: 16). This “crisis of representation” pushed social scientists to look into the limitations of scientific knowledge. Ethnography could no longer be seen as an “objective” practice but instead there was a growing need to recognise the reflexive nature of it (Adams et al. 2015: 22). However, it is important to note that even though personal narratives were not present in anthropological and sociological writing, the personal connection to subject matters have often been at the background of these disciplines (Anderson 2006: 375-376). It is misleading to think that before the term ‘autoethnography’ was invented, there was no autoethnography or that ant horologists did not bring anything personal to their work. On the contrary, reflexivity has always been

present in the works of anthropologists and sociologists (Atkinson 2006: 402). However, in the late 1980's, the growing interest to combine personal narratives with more traditional writing meant that autoethnography as a term started to appear more often in anthropological and sociological writing (Adams et al. 2015: 16-17). This change was not warmly welcomed by everyone and some anthropologists have dismissed the value of subjective narratives. These critics call for the objective approach that according to them is more "scientific" (Chang 2008: 45). This criticism has been welcomed by many (see for example Anderson 2006; Atkinson 2006) and I agree with the notion that even when ethnography is based on writer's own experiences, it needs to be applicable to a wider group of people. To understand this critique better, I will look into the differences between *analytic* and *evocative* autoethnography.

Autoethnographical canon includes a wide variety of different orientations such as autobibliograpical ethnography, ethnobiography, evocative narratives and native anthropology, to name just a few. For the purpose of this thesis, it is not necessary to get into all the different subcategories, but I will briefly introduce the two main schools of autoethnography: evocative and analytical ethnography. Leo Anderson, who is a vocal advocate for more analytic approach sets five main principles of analytic autoethnography. These principles are: "(1) complete member researcher (CMR) status, (2) analytic reflexivity, (3) narrative visibility of the researcher's self, (4) dialogue with informants beyond the self, and (5) commitment to theoretical analysis." (Anderson 2006:378). For analytic autoethnographers' it is the commitment to larger analytical and theoretical framework that is still in the centre of their work, whereas for evocative autoethnographers' it is more important to bring forth the very personal and empathising stories of lived life. What Anderson calls analytical autoethnography, Ellis and Bochner (2016: 432) would prefer to call realist ethnography. For them, the aim of autoethnography is not to "---appropriate lived experience for the purpose of abstracting something they call knowledge or theory" (Ellis & Bochner 2016: 431). As a student of anthropology, it is difficult for me to agree with Ellis' and Bochner's definition. Instead, I will follow Anderson's description of analytical

autoethnography in which the research is visible, active, and reflexively engaged (Anderson 2006: 383) but only as a part of a larger group of participants, and the aim of the ethnography is to form an analytical argument based on theoretical research. In other words, anthropological autoethnography is not the same as autobiography or reflexive storytelling. Instead, autoethnographies are to be "--- reflected upon, analysed, and interpreted within their broader sociocultural context" (Chang 2008: 46).

Unlike in evocative autoethnography, in which the personal narratives are meant to be emotionally moving and sympathetic, for analytical autoethnography, the personal narrative needs to be essential to the argument and research topic. If personal narrative is there just as "decorative flourish", it becomes self-absorbed and does not serve its purpose (Anderson 2006: 358). The purpose of autoethnography, for those who defend its evocative nature, is to make the reader to feel the writer's pain, to care and to empathise, not use it as a means to describe something analytical about wider societal phenomena (Ellis & Bochner 2016: 433). Whereas the opposite is true for analytical autoethnography under which anthropology falls under. "Rather, the defining characteristic of analytic social science is to use empirical data to gain insight into some broader set of social phenomena than those provided by the data themselves" (Anderson 2006: 387). So, for me, during the writing process, I repeatedly asked myself: does this revelation of my personal life bring anything to the forefront that makes a difference to the overall, analytical research topic. I will use my own story and talk about the topic in first persona a fair amount. This is not because I believe that my experiences are interesting as such, to the reader, but that they reflex the feelings and struggles of so many that have similar lifestyle to mine and, hence, can be used as a material for my overall argument.

3.2 Multi-sited ethnography and ethnography at home

The idea that the world is divided into coherent areas that contain a 'culture' or a 'community' and that anthropologists study this location bounded, cohesive culture is no longer applicable (Gupta & Ferguson 1992: 6-7). Questions of space and place and also of mobility are not only theoretical approaches in anthropology but methodological as well. Since the exclusionary fieldwork practices, where an anthropologist did his or her fieldwork in a single, bounded location, only reinforced the image of coherent cultures that exist in the limits of a geographical location, the traditional ways of doing ethnography have been questioned. The "crisis of representation" in the end of the 1980's was a reaction to the mounting criticism against the ethnographers privileged and totalising gaze. As a result, the diversity and tensions within the ethnographic methods have been increasing (Atkinson et al. 1999: 463). In anthropology the reception has been divided: some argue that anthropology needs to follow this trend and adapt both theory and methodology to the "era of globalisation" (Frohlick 2007: 87), whereas others question the whole notion of "global ethnography" (Moore 2004). Some have even gone as far as to claim that globalisation has made the need to belong to fixed and separate societies redundant (Dawson & Rapport 1998: 3-5). Within this debate, one thing that both sides seem to agree with, is the realisation that place and location cannot be taken as given or natural (Gupta & Ferguson 1997: 6-7). This criticism has led to pluralisation of "the field" and the way fieldwork is conducted. Multi-sited ethnography, auto-ethnography and ethnography "at home" are examples of this diversification. To see the field in a new light means that space and place cannot be seen as unchallenged starting points for it. As Gupta and Ferguson (1992: 18) write:

"An anthropology whose objects are no longer conceived as automatically and naturally anchored in space will need to pay particular attention to the way spaces and places are made, imagined, contested, and enforced".

How to demarcate the field has become increasingly important for anthropologists. However, the idea that the works of earlier anthropologists were somehow 'bounded' whereas the current ones are unlimited, has been under criticism as well. As Augé (1995: 8) notes, anthropologists always deal with here and now. Their ethnography is always an observation that is situated in a certain time and place. Atkinson et al. (1999: 470) argue that the tradition to look back in history and to organise and box certain periods under one label is misleading. They do not agree with the notion that earlier ethnography was always limited and without plurality whereas now our methods are more complex and varied. Instead, they argue that the repeated, longstanding tensions between different methods give ethnography its vigour and impetus. In other words, 'traditional' ethnography was no more bounded and limited than the current one, and the multi-sited ethnographies of today deal with the issues of locality and limitation just as much as the previous ones (Candea 2007: 169-170). When it comes to the field – in other words single-sited versus multi-sited – or to the personal involvement with the subject – such as traditional ethnography versus autoethnography – the ruptures between different methods and fields are much less prominent than some debates make them out to be (Atkinson 2006: 400).

According to Marcus (1995: 96) the rise of multi-sited ethnography followed the postmodern interest in globalisation, which could not be studied from a single location but needed a broader ethnographic scope. As Candea (2007) notes, this idea now seems quite naïve and too simple. The ethnographer always "cuts out" his or her site and chooses the method of how to demarcate his/her subject group (Candea 2007: 171) and despite the growing globalisation, lived lives still always happen in locations (Moore 2004: 72). Multi-sitedness, as such, does not make a topic more fluid or "seamless" than an ethnography done in one location. By moving fieldwork from single location to multiple ones, does not mean that suddenly anthropologists are able to give all-encompassing accounts of the world 'out there' (Candea 2007: 169). According to Marcus (1995: 96), anthropological research has moved away from" single site intensive investigations" to examine the "circulation of cultural meanings, objects, and identities in diffuse time-space".

I do not disagree with this statement as such, but I am inclined to align myself with Candea (2007) and Moore (2004) in not seeing the necessity of multi-sited ethnography in order to study global phenomena. I could have easily done my fieldwork in one location, such as Palma de Mallorca, which is a yachting hub. I did not need to move between different locations in order to study mobility and how it affects people. It was only due to the nature of my work and lifestyle, why the material for this thesis is collected in multiple locations. From a methodological perspective, mobility and location boundedness are not mutually exclusive categories. Instead, local and global are best seen only as heuristic devices that do not as such exist as empirical realities (Moore 2004: 73). In other words: grounding fieldwork in location does not make it bounded and totalising, but instead it is about understanding the interconnection of flows of people and ideas, images and goods (Moore 2004: 78).

Another growing trend in anthropology is “native ethnography”. In 1985 ASA (Association of Social Anthropologists) published a volume called “Anthropology at Home”. Its purpose was to call attention to the benefits and problems that arise from doing ethnography anthropology at ‘home’. The thirteen different papers that were selected for the publication did not talk about autoethnography but were, nevertheless, a turn towards more reflexive and inward-looking ethnography. This idea of doing field work at ‘home’ opposed to the more traditional ethnography that is based on a notion of being away from home poses a question: “What is home?”. If we do not have a clear idea what ‘home’ means, how can we be away from there? If I live in Spain and call it my ‘home’, am I doing fieldwork at home or away, since I am not Spanish after all? This question applies the other way around as well. Suppose I decided to do ethnography in Finland but on a topic that I am not familiar with. Would I be working at home even though the culture and the community that I am working with are totally new and unknown for me? Would just the fact that I am doing the fieldwork in Finland, which is my “home country”, be an adequate condition to be counted as anthropology at home? It is because of questions like this, I find the topic of ‘home’ extremely fascinating.

3.3 Interviews and participants

I have spent over nine years working in the yachting industry and most of this time I did not have a home. The reason why I chose this topic is because over the years I realised how much homelessness and being uprooted affected my perception of the world; ‘home’ was not a concept that I could take for granted anymore. In early 2019, when I started to think about returning to my studies and writing my thesis, I started to consider using my own experiences as my main ethnographical source. Autoethnography is not something that we were ever encouraged to do or was talked about on the methodology courses, so the thought was quite scary. Would it be enough to solely talk about my own experiences? As I had talked about the subject extensively with my friends, I was not alone with my feelings I decided it was best to combine autoethnography with more traditional methods.

Since, when I started my writing process, I was in Finland and could not interview anyone in person, I decided to conduct interviews via email. Originally, I wanted to interview approximately ten people, who I did not know personally, about what home meant for them. In order to find those people, I posted on a Facebook page called “Palma Yacht Crew” The page consists of very mixed posts and the only criterion is that it has to be yachting related. The group is closed but it had over 60,000 members at the time I posted my ad about looking for volunteers to share their experiences about homelessness. My only criterion was that the person had to have experienced voluntary homelessness either in the past or was currently homeless. Within 24 hours I had fifteen people who had contacted me and agreed to be interviewed. Four of them I knew from before, all the others were complete strangers. In the end, out of the fifteen initial contacts, only five answered my questions in a way that was useful for this thesis. Of these five, I knew one from before.

After the initial contact, I sent each person the same set of questions and depending on their answers, I emailed them again with follow up questions. The woman I knew from before, I also met a couple of months later in Antigua and was able to continue the interview in person. As these interviews were conducted via email, I will mainly use direct quotes from these participants. As the response was a bit disappointing, I decided to draw more from my friends, with whom I had discussed the topic before. Luckily, both for the interviews and for my personal finances, I got a call at the end of the January 2020 to go and take part in a yacht race in the Caribbean. In the end I worked on the boat for four months which gave me an opportunity to talk to my friends and ask questions in informal settings and also conduct more formal interviews. These conversations took place in Antigua and Newport, Rhode Island. In the final version, I ended up using quotes and material from five of my friends which brings the number of interviewees to ten people.

As mentioned earlier, the only criterion for my interviewees, was personal experience of homelessness. The majority of the people who approached me were women and, in the end, out of the people I interviewed only three were men and all of them were people I knew before. It is difficult to judge whether the reason why such a clear majority of who responded to my social media enquiry were women, was because women feel emotionally more affected by homelessness, or because in general men do not respond as often as women to requests like mine. In the end, even though I had a few men who promised to help me out, only one man (someone who I knew already) answered my email questionnaire. Unfortunately, his one-word answers did not provide any useful material and I did not end up using him as a source. Because of this obvious bias, I made sure that I talked to my male friends when I had a chance to do that in person. I have pondered on any gender related questions very little because of men are still underrepresented in my ethnography. Especially since feminist theories have given so much to the discourse of space and place and how we now understand more and more about gendered spaces, it would be interesting to get deeper into this aspect of home from the aspect of elite homelessness, but

unfortunately I do not have a possibility to do that within the framework of this thesis.

4 How to be a yachtie

As the yachting industry is not familiar for everyone, in this chapter I will explain the day to day reality that the ‘yachties’ live in, and the struggles we have when it comes to our mobility. In its broadest definition, a yacht is a watercraft used for leisure or sport. It can refer to either a motor or sail powered boat and its size can vary from a few meters up to over hundred meters. (Superyacht, Wikipedia). Not only the size varies greatly but also the style, the cost and the way the yachts are used. For the purpose of this thesis, I will focus on two types of yachts: super yachts (in its broadest definition) and racing yachts (sailing). What is important here is not the type or the size of the boat but that these two types of yachts form the professional yachting industry.

4.1 Super yachts

Even though the term yacht can refer to any type of a watercraft, in everyday language, the term has connotations of luxury and wealth. Often the word is coupled with terms like ‘mega’, ‘super’ or ‘luxury’ to emphasise the size or grandeur of the vessel. The term ´super yacht´ is ambiguous and the definition varies. Southampton University’s maritime academy defines it in the following way: “A superyacht is a commercially operated luxury yacht (motor or sail powered), which is professionally crewed and has a loadline length of 24 metres and above. Some yachts are either used exclusively by their owners or are available part-time for commercial charter, while others are operated all year round as charter businesses” (Solent University). The number of crew onboard these vessels may vary from anything between two (captain and a deck/stewardess) to over fifty people. Solent maritime academy estimates that the industry directly employs somewhere between 148,000 to 163,000 personnel on a global level. These numbers are very rough, but they give us some indication of the size of the industry.

There are multiple different work roles on super yachts, and I will not get into that side of the industry in detail but what is pertinent to note, is that typically everybody who is employed by a super yacht lives aboard the vessel. Often the crew cabins are very small and shared with at least one another person. There is very little room to store personal kit but, since the work uniform is provided by the boat and is expected to be worn at all times when working, there is no huge need to bring a lot of personal items on board. Personal space and privacy are also very limited due to the living arrangements. If a yacht undergoes a yard period during which the crew cannot live aboard, accommodation on land is provided by the owner. The crew of the boat has very limited or no power at all to decide when and where the yacht moves and often these decisions are made or changed at the very last minute. This means that a person working on the yacht is not in control of their own itinerary but instead needs to move or stay put depending on the owners wishes. Even though the super yacht industry might seem luxurious and glamorous from the outside, the reality is often far from it.

4.2 Race boats

If the definition of super yacht industry is ambiguous, the industry of professionally run and raced sailing boats is even more difficult to determine. I will not get into all the intricacies of yacht racing since it would not serve any purpose for this thesis, but I will briefly explain what kind of lifestyle this industry creates for the people who work on these boats. There are thousands of sailing regattas around the world on a yearly basis. Most of these regattas consist of boats that are sailed by people who do it for fun and most of the time owners do not pay wages for their crew. On the contrary, often the owner asks the crew to bring their own food and drink (if needed) and contribute a small sum towards the regatta/race entry fee. At the other end of the spectrum are fully professionally run sailing events such as the America’s Cup and the Volvo Ocean Race in which each team has a budget starting from few million to up to over hundred million dollars. In between these two opposites, there is a circuit of annual regattas and races that are sailed

by both professional and amateur sailors and which is the site of a niche industry of professional sailing.

There is an overlap of people and locations between the racing and superyacht industry; some of the super yachts participate in regattas as well, or the owner of a super yacht owns a second boat that is used purely for racing. Overlap exists also because a lot of the regattas are held in places that are hubs for superyachts, due to their natural beauty, and hence attractive sailing locations. Such places are Sardinia in the Mediterranean and St Barths in the Caribbean. There are a few locations in the world that have profiled themselves as centres in the yachting world, and thus have a high concentration of services for the yachts. One of such places is Palma de Mallorca in Europe or Newport, Rhode Island in the United States. Within the racing scene, there are a number of professional sailors who work only as race crew. These people are flown in for each regatta/race and flown back home before the next one. For them the distinction between home and work is clear and the notion of home is not ambiguous. Thus, I have not included them and their experiences in this thesis. Instead, I am interested in the experiences of those sailors who work and travel within the racing circuit full time. Even with this narrowing down, the people who fall in this category form a highly heterogeneous group. Within this group there are people who work fulltime and long-term for one boat owner. Their situation is somewhat similar to the people who work on superyachts in a sense that they do not have real ability to influence their itineraries and schedules. Their accommodation and other expenses are also paid by the yacht owner, which makes their lifestyle affluent but highly controlled.

The last group that I will focus on, is those boat workers, who do not have long term employment contracts, but instead bounce around between different locations and boats. This does not mean that they travel wherever and whenever they feel like but normally locate themselves in a few different yachting hubs, some of which I mentioned earlier, and work on contracts that can be anything from one day up to a season. Sometimes these contracts might consist of a few

regattas, which does not provide enough income for one season, and, thus, in between regattas they have to find other work such as delivering cruising boats. People within this group have the most precarious situation in the industry; they do not have any social benefits such as sick leave or holiday pay and they can be let go at any time without any notice period. During a regatta or delivery, their expenses are paid but in between jobs they have to find their own accommodation. Most often this accommodation means sleeping on friends' sofas or renting a room in a shared accommodation for a few nights or weeks. Often, the money they make is spent on travelling instead of being saved. There are, again, exceptions to the rule, but this is the norm. This kind of lifestyle often becomes stressful after a while, but the reason why a lot of people are drawn to it is the freedom it provides. Being in control of one's own schedule is the upside that often outweighs the stress that comes with the lifestyle.

Since the actual theme of this thesis is not the yachting industry, I will not get into the intricacies of it any further than this. Some of my interviewees are life-long sailors, who work purely on sail boats, whereas some knew nothing about boats before they entered the industry. Throughout my work, I will use the term yachting industry to refer to both superyachts and sail racing boat industries. I will also be using the term "yachtie" to describe a person who works in the industry and will not be distinguishing between the different groups. I am aware that not everyone likes the term and do not identify as one. In fact, the term is often used in a derogatory sense. A phrase "I am not a typical yachtie" is common amongst the people who work in the industry. Especially those who work primarily on sail racing boats and who often want to distance themselves from those who work on superyachts. When used in a derogatory way, 'yachtie' is used to describe a person, who is more interested in making money and partying instead of for the love of sea and boats. A stereotypical yachtie is a young, white male, who has nothing else to talk about than work and partying and spends his spare time getting drunk with other yachties, never exploring the places they visit or making connections with the "outside world". They live inside a yachtie-bubble that is detached from the outside world. Like I said, I am aware of these negative

connotations, but I will nevertheless use the term because it is useful when I need one term to describe the group that I am studying. My intention is not to imply that everyone who works in the industry shares the same values and believes, nor that their behaviour is similar. In fact, ‘yachties’ are a fairly homogeneous group. Why only fairly homogenous? Because the vast majority who work in the industry are white and come from somewhat privileged backgrounds. Not privileged in a sense that in their home countries they are considered wealthy or upper-class but in a sense that they are able to travel to different countries without having a job lined up, and to be able to travel to and reside in countries that they are not citizens of. On a global level this means that the person has to have a certain level of wealth and privilege in order to be able to do this.

4.3 A typical story of a yachtie

As mentioned earlier, this thesis is partly autoethnographic. Instead of trying to describe how the life trajectories of yachties often unfold through multiple examples, I have decided to tell my own, personal story. My story is by no means unique or atypical within the yachting community, and this is the reason why I have decided to use it as an example. Sailing has always been a big part of my life; it was my family’s past time activity when I was young, I competed at an international level in Olympic sailing and worked in teaching and coaching for years as well. Thus, I have always identified myself strongly with sailing and joining a sailing community anywhere in the world has never been a problem for me.

I first moved to Australia in the autumn of 2011. I travelled around the country, working in sailing here and there and collecting data for my thesis that I was meant to start writing the following year. After I had returned to Finland early 2012, with the intention of finishing my studies, I quickly lost my interest and moved back to Australia. It was in Sydney, where I started my career as a professional sailor, and immersed myself in a lifestyle that I did not previously know existed. Thanks to the connections I had made earlier, I quickly found work

on private sailing boats. This work was mainly badly paid and consisted of low-level jobs such as cleaning boats. Even though the day to day work was very far from glamorous or rewarding, it gave me an “in” to a very cliquey network of sailors and boat owners. Through these initial contacts, I was able to slowly move up in the ranks and get to a situation where I got paid to do regattas in some of the most expensive destinations in the world, on boats that cost tens of millions of euros to build and run. I was constantly travelling between different continents; mainly between Australia, Europe and North America, but my work took me to every single continent of the globe, apart from Antarctica.

Since I was constantly on the move, for years, I did not have a home anywhere. Instead, I lived out of a suitcase. Lot of the time, my accommodation was provided by the boat owner but because there were regular breaks between jobs, I spent a lot of time staying at friends’ houses or sometimes I rented a room for a couple of nights or weeks. Very seldomly I stayed in one place more than a few weeks at a time, often even less than that. A lot of the time, my work also consisted of moving boats from one place to another. These trips took up to six weeks and often during that time there was no ability to connect with the outside world.

Even though the industry is highly competitive and totally unregulated, which means that the normal rules and regulations of hiring and firing do not apply, the first few years I really enjoyed the lifestyle. I loved the fact that I was not tied to a single location or a job and that I could literally be anywhere in the world the following week. I loved it that I had hardly any overheads, which I had to worry about, so I could spend most of my salary on fun holidays or going back to Finland, whenever I was between jobs. Life was hectic but I did not mind. However, after a few years, the novelty started to wear off. I started missing having a place where I could leave my things instead of always lugging everything around with me. I started resenting the fact that I never knew my plans or schedule more than a few weeks ahead, which made relationships difficult. There were a few places to which I returned regularly to and had wonderful friends, but

I never felt at home. I still visited my family and friends in Finland, at least once a year, but being back in Finland did not feel like I was back home either.

In 2016, after having been homeless for four years, I decided that I needed a home. I had spent a lot of time in Palma de Mallorca, Spain, which is one of the yachting hubs. I had always liked the island and since migrating to the United State or Australia (of which I had dreamt about earlier) was too difficult and expensive, I decided to make Palma my home. By the end of 2016 I had found a property and finally in January 2017 I bought the place. I had also started a full-time job as a rigger, which meant that I was still involved in the yachting industry and did a fair amount of travelling, but my day to day work life had changed back to “normal” Monday to Friday, nine to five.

That arrangement did not last more than 18 months. I loved living in Palma, and I felt my apartment was my home, but at the same time, I did not feel like I was going to stay in Palma, or in the rigging job, for the rest of my life. I had some friends around, but I as my closest friends in yachting were still traveling around all the time, I did not have the sense of community in Palma, even after the couple of years living there, that I had really longed for. It felt like I was only taking a breather while trying to figure out my next move. Towards the end of 2017, I met an English man that I started a relationship with. That meant that I was again flying between countries on a monthly basis. I did not mind the travel, but I was getting bored with my job. So, when in May 2018 I got a job offer to sail around the world, I took it. This meant that my life would be uprooted again. Originally the job was meant to last for the next three years, but just over a year later, in August 2019 I resigned and returned to Finland in order to finally finish my master’s degree.

While I am writing this, I am still torn between three countries; part of me wants to return to Finland permanently but at the same time being back has proven to be mentally more difficult than I expected. I still have my apartment in Spain and

every time I return there, I remember why I wanted to move there in the first place. Also, I am still in a relationship with the Englishman and after over two years of long-distance relationship, I would love to be in the same country with him. Despite my search for a home, I still haven't been able to find a place where I feel like "this is where I belong, this is my home". It is against this background that I reflect the theories about homelessness and location connection.

4.4 "Thinness" of nomadic lifestyle

A yachtie lifestyle is very similar to a nomadic lifestyle, in a sense that the moving around is perpetual. Yachties, like nomads, are constantly on the move. More than often there is not only one place that they call home, but several. What separates my research subjects, myself included, from nomads is the ability to be in charge of one's own itinerary. Yachties are compelled to move around following the requirements of the industry. The when, how and where we move is determined by our jobs. As I described earlier, superyacht crews almost always move with the yacht. However, even for those not permanently employed, the availability of work in certain hubs and at specific times of the year, limits the ability to choose their location freely. Also, the ability to stay outside your own country's borders is a limiting factor. For example, for the many Australian, American and New Zealand national yachties, the rule which allows them to stay in the Schengen area up to 90 days in any 180-day period, sets some limitations. However, there are ways to get around these laws. For example, if a person is employed full time by a boat, technically whenever they are on board the boat, they are in the country that the boat is registered in, instead of being in the country that they are physically in at any given time. When a crew member joins a vessel, he or she will be stamped onto the boat and out of the Schengen area and this way they do not have to worry about the normal 90 days in every 180 days -rule. Similar rules apply to Europeans in the US and so forth. The ability to travel almost limitlessly around the world changes the perception of borders and location. When nowhere is further than flew flights away, and you rarely have to worry about visas or the cost of the flights, the world and locations change their meaning. At the same time, if your family and friends are scattered everywhere

around the world, the connection to any single location diminishes. Being mobile means regular absence from family and friends which, consequently, changes our perception of belonging and even shapes the way relationships are formed. Some suggest that mobility hinders formation of long-term romantic partnerships, whereas others see relationships as a reason for mobility (Nowicka 2006: 36-37; Urry 2007: 37). I do not think it is an either/or situation, instead, I think it is both. Being highly mobile has definitely impacted my relationships (both romantic and platonic), but the reason for my travelling is often my need to see family and friends in person. Despite the ubiquity of technological ways to "connect", there are limits to the intimacy that is not experienced by face-to-face contact (Bude & Dürrschmidt 2010: 490).

One of the ways mobility changes relationships is their intensity. Since I typically only have a limited amount of time with my partner, my family or my friends, during the time I am with them, I am fully focused on nothing but them. Thus, absence can be transformed into a strength. However, this can be a difficult concept to grasp for those who have always been geographically immobile. For example, when I explain the everyday reality of seeing my partner only every couple of months, I have had people questioning its seriousness. This, I see, is an indication of the fact that despite all the hype around virtual communication, we still live in a world where physical closeness persists over the virtual. A common feature that highly mobile people have is their ability to compartmentalise their lives. This is not a unique feature that applies to only highly mobile people, but extreme spatial compartmentalisation is a skill that highly mobile people have to learn (Amit 2007: 64). However, this does not come without complications. Even when we are voluntarily moving around all the time or are homeless, this type of lifestyle changes how we perceive ourselves and the world around us: it creates a constant feeling of displacement (Amit 2007: 62). I have missed so many of my friends' weddings as well as births and birthdays of my nieces and nephews as well as my grandparents' and a friend's funerals. Not having a home, always being "away" is not only a physical element of the way I live but reflects my existence in the world. This constant feeling of

disappointing family and friends leads to a feeling of not being a 'whole' member of society (Nowicka 2007: 76). I personally feel that I spend so much time packing and unpacking, travelling and waiting in transit, getting my head around a new place that I am in, and making an effort to get to know the people I will spend the next few weeks with, that I miss out on things that actually matter to me.

"I really, deeply started to miss having a home. What I was considering at the beginning as freedom became a handicap that stopped me from moving forward in my life and having projects. Looking for places to stay in and moving all the time takes up so much time, money and energy that I was feeling I wasn't doing anything properly anymore, like a sport, an activity, a project etc. I was feeling I was everywhere and nowhere, and I couldn't focus on anything." (Elsa, 34)

I recognise the feeling Elsa describes well. To have a hobby, to make plans or to be able to commit to something are all things that become novelties and visions of a better life "at home". The seemingly boring and mundane activities of home-life form a base on which we build our reality and feeling of comfort and safety (Scott 2009: 49-50). A sense of home is grounded in the activities that happen in places, just as much as they are a place per se (Jackson 1995: 148). According to Nowicka (2007: 77), the need to create everyday routines is overly present in the lives of highly mobile people. For those, who only travel occasionally, the time spent away from home is time to enjoy the randomness of a holiday; it is about breaking the mundane habits of everyday life. On the contrary, for those who are constantly on the move, the need to bridge spatial gaps between different places and in order to generate familiarity in new surroundings, routines are the key. This need for continuity and routine has been found to be present in the lives of nomadic tribes as well. Nomadic people often consistently arrange their furniture and orient their tents the same way each time and position themselves in the same relation to other group members as well (Werner et al. 1985: 8). Without any routines, which cannot be sustained if there is no time to ever establish them, a person starts to feel like she or he has nothing to anchor her- or himself to. In

other words, being ‘at home’ is best understood as the ability to perform daily routines through which one’s identity is mediated (Dawson & Rapport 1998: 10).

“Do I miss having a home? Yes, I do. I went through a phase where I moved around a lot. For about a year I didn’t settle at all and in the end, I felt like a ghost. Like I was starting to lose all my substance so now I like to stay places usually volunteering for 3 months at a time.” (Erica, 39)

Erica is a 39-year-old Australian. She enjoys her lifestyle and has no intention of settling down anywhere, but even she noted how the homelessness affects her negatively. Unlike Deleuze and Guttari (2010 [1986]: 356) argue that: “The life of the nomad is in the intermezzo”, I claim that the life of a traveller is particularly seen through a lens of space and place. When travelling becomes a chore, a shapeless time that is wasted in non-places, the places that we feel connected to, become even more important. Like in the quote from Erica, constant travel generates a feeling of losing personal substance. If life is mainly spent in non-spaces, a person starts to become a non-person. I agree with Bude and Dürrschmidt (2010: 490) when they write: “This is not to romanticize locality, home or family, but to problematize claims that communication technology can indefinitely extend the time—space distances over which intimate milieu can be maintained---".

5 Being “homeless”

The concept of home inherently includes the idea of homelessness. As far as we know, there have always been people without permanent, physical dwelling place (Cresswell 2014: 174). Homelessness has multiple different forms and there is a myriad of reasons why it occurs. Typically, the term evokes an image of a person sleeping on the street or in a doorway, and is associated with economic problems, substance abuse, mental health issues and violence. However, homelessness does not occur only because of economic condition but it is also a symptom of

uprootedness (Arnold 2004: 3). Poverty driven homelessness is an extremely important topic to study, however, due to the scope of this thesis, there won't be enough room to look further into this kind of homelessness. Instead, I will be focusing on homelessness that is caused by extreme mobility.

To have a home and to be homeless are normally seen as mutually exclusive ways to be. But, as I mentioned earlier, they are not as simple concepts as first might seem. There are multiple ways to live and also to be homeless. Home is not necessarily a house or apartment. One can feel very much at home in a place that is not typically seen as a "proper" home or one can feel homeless even if she/he lived permanently somewhere (Wardhaug 1999: 93-94). Some equate the feeling of not belonging with homelessness (Amit-Talai 1998: 48). Homelessness is something that is produced through our understanding of place and belonging (Cresswell 2014: 175-176). As our understanding of place and space have changed, the idea that a home is one single place, where a person has grown up and feels rooted, is quickly eroding as well. A person can have multiple homes and feel a sense of belonging in all or in none of them (Bude & Dürrschmidt 2010: 493). Thus, home is a dynamic entity that moves and changes as people become more mobile.

The subjectivity of homelessness became apparent very quickly in my interviews. The starting point for my interviews was "Are you currently homeless?". I did not specify what I meant by home or by being homeless, instead, I was interested to see how people reacted to this question. I, myself have felt homeless for the majority of the past nine years, even though I currently own an apartment in Spain, I have access to an apartment in Helsinki and I can go and stay at my partner's home in England whenever I want to. However, I did not want to assume that everyone in the yachting industry shared my feeling of homelessness and, thus, left the question open. It became apparent that the feeling of homelessness varied significantly. In my interviews, two people in very similar living situations described whether they had a home or not very differently.

Ben, Jacqui and Theresa live onboard the yacht they work on. Jacqui owns a house in her native England, but she rents it out, whereas Theresa has just started to rent a small room in a shared apartment in Hamburg. Ben, however, does not rent or own anywhere. Jacqui and I regard ourselves as homeless whereas Theresa and Ben do not. I have been criticised for calling myself homeless and I understand why it might sound quite absurd and even insulting to some people, considering the amount of people who have no access to any kind of shelter. However, homelessness is not a synonym for sleeping rough or lack of shelter. Like I mentioned above, home and homelessness are states of being instead of just physical places where to sleep (Wardhaug 1999: 95).

"Home for me is a place that you love, a place where you have people that you love and somewhere where you are happy to invest your time and money. I casually use the word 'home' to describe my current place of residence, however I believe the word has more of an emotional attachment than just physical". (Courtney, 29)

5.1 Migrants, vagrants and the "mobile elite"

Physically mobile people can be divided very roughly into two groups: those who migrate because they can and those who migrate because they need to. Highly skilled, lifestyle, and retirement migrants form the biggest part of the first group whereas the second group consists of people who have a pressing need, whether based on poverty, thereat of violence or persecution, to leave their home countries (Castles 2017: xi). Another way to make a division, is to focus on the type of the movement. Theories of migration and belonging have often been based on the premise that mobility is temporary. It has been seen as movement between a place of origin and a destination. The "natural" state of the world has been presented as fixed and bounded, which in return means that uprootedness is a pathological condition (Hastrup & Olwig 1997: 6). The main difference between migrants and mobilities is that migrants are expected to integrate to their

new country while maintaining connection to their “home country”, while mobile people are expected to develop multiple roots or not be connected to any single place (Nowicka 2006: 141). Despite the apparent differences between these groups, this division is, of course, oversimplified. In reality, different types of migration mix with one another and do not fit in neat categories (Nail 2015: 3). However, as I am not mainly interested in migration that happens from place A to place B, I will be focusing on those who are chronically mobile.

Chronically mobile people can be further divided into two groups: one side of the coin is the romanticised ideal of mobile elites, whereas on the other side is the stigmatised picture of the rootless traveller that threatens the order of the world. Highly mobile people are seen as the new world elite, and mobility has become the main stratifying factor (Andreotti et al. 2012: 44; Bauman 2010: 254; Nowicka 2006: 33). The degree of mobility determines one’s social class: those who are higher up are free to leave and leave those, who are bound to stay behind (Bauman 1998: 86). What is important is the personal ability to make the decision when to change location. The highly glamorised notion of modern nomadism is associated with the freedom to move wherever and whenever (Kannisto 2016: 222). The term “wanderlust” that is so often used in social media, nowadays, represents the ideal of a free-spirited traveller who is not restricted by the mundane grind of everyday life but instead lives an exciting lifestyle, constantly collecting new experiences. This location-independence is at the heart of nomadism. According to Kannisto, a nomad’s aim and purpose is to avoid any kind of commitment to a location. She writes:

“Global nomads are homeless travellers who—by practising extreme mobilities—aim to live location-independently, seeking detachment not only from particular geographical locations but also from discourses of territorial belonging” (Kannisto 2016: 222).

Kannisto's definition follows Deleuze and Guttari's ideas that they presented in 1986 in their book *Nomadology: The War Machine.* The book draws the outlines of what we still understand as the principle characteristics of a nomad. According to Deleuze and Guttari (2010 [1986]: 356-357), a nomad is interested in places just as points on his trajectory. He is only reaching points in order to leave them behind again. A nomad is not interested in creating a new home, in a new location, like a migrant is, instead, it is the deterritorialisation itself that constitutes nomad's relation to earth and location. Even though unforced movement is a source of economic and cultural advantage (Urry 2007: 51-52), the ingrained prejudice against drifters and vagabonds still exists in Western cultures (Jackson 1995: 84). Leivestad's (2018) work shows the stigma around caravan dwellers whereas Oakley (1983) and Kabachnik (2012) write about the historical and current prejudices against gypsies. Thus, to automatically associate power and privilege with mobility is misleading. Even for those, who have willingly left and actively seek a nomadic lifestyle, homelessness is never without complications. Mobility and the lack of a stable home will inevitably lead to a certain degree of expulsion from territorial, political, juridical, or economic status (Nail 2015: 2).

It is also too simplified to draw parallels between migration and homelessness; not all migrants are homeless and not all homeless people are in precarious situations. There is, however, a connection between the sense of self and the level of mobility. Bisharat (2001: 204) argues that in a world where the connection between peoples and places is under a threat, identities are vehemently spatialised. Why I chose to call my research subjects "voluntarily homeless" instead of nomads, is the connotation of location disconnect, that is associated with nomadism. Even though yachties are voluntarily homeless and constantly on the move, their life is still connected to specific locations. They do not travel for the sake of travelling but their moving around is determined by the demands of their occupation.

5.2 Home polygamy

Home and homelessness are often seen as binary opposites; either one has a home, in other words, a place where to reside or she/he does not. These two categories are laden with normative associations. While 'home' is associated with safety, privacy, and order, 'homelessness' is a synonym for tension, anxiety and chaos (Arnold 2004: 19; Wardhaug 1999: 96). However, empirical studies show that home-homelessness is not a zero-sum game. A person can feel very much at home in several different locations or feel content even if they describe themselves homeless.

Nikki is a 25-year-old American and a good friend of mine. I have known her for years and throughout our friendship she has always been keen to travel as long as she has a chance to visit her native Maine at regular intervals. Unlike I and our mutual friend Belinda, Nikki does not have negative feelings towards homelessness.

"Home has taken on a lot of different meanings for me over the years—when I'm in America, I consider Maine to be home, but when I travel abroad, I quickly start to gain an affinity and connection to place, making me rarely ever miss my true home. For many years I've felt more at home in Palma and Antigua than anywhere else, despite almost always living in a new apartment or place each stay.**"** (Nikki, 25)

Ben, who has been working in the industry for the past ten years, visits his native Australia only once every two or three years. When I asked him if he still feels Australian, he says yes, of course, but that Australia does not feel like home to him anymore. Instead, he feels more at home in Falmouth, England.

"I think it's because I spend a lot of time there. I find the Cornish people quite similar to the Australians in a sense that they are very laid back, so I feel quite

comfortable there". Ben also described how he feels at home in multiple places. For him the feeling of home comes from having some local friends, who share same interests and attitude as him, in the location and knowing his way around the city or area. "So, I guess the feeling of home for me is time spent somewhere". (Ben, 30)

Ben's example shows how, even though he identifies himself as Australian, it is not his home anymore. In fact, he does not feel like he has one single home, but instead, multiple that exist all over the world.

Ulrich Beck (2000: 73) calls a situation like this, where a person has voluntarily divided his/her life between different places, *place polygamy*. Transnational place polygamy, where a person feels that she/he belongs to and loves more than one place, is often present in yachtie's life. When yachties envision life after settling down, it still often entails an idea about having multiple homes around the world, or at least extensive travelling. As people become increasingly mobile, home is no longer a single place, instead it turns into multiple locations (bell hooks 1990). Even though I long for a home, in my fantasies about the future, I have at least a couple of different properties in different places around the world. This aspiration is common amongst highly mobile people (Nowicka 2006: 108). The ability to create a feeling of "being at home" in multiple locations, also enables some of the yachties to be totally comfortable with not having a "proper" home anywhere. However, it is important to note that not every place has the potential to become meaningful. It is only locations with enough personal history and a feeling of community after a period of time start to feel "like home". Following Marc Augé's (1995: 77-78) definition, a place is only a location that is relational, historical and concerned with identity. In this sense, home-building is not restricted to one location, but can be a network of places that together form a space called 'home'. Another way to conceptualise this is to see space as a structure. This metaphor accentuates the idea that home is not a geographical location that is rooted in single culture or locality, but instead, it is a space that connects different locations and consists of everyday practises and habits. Through these habits and

practices, we create a space that limits as well as enables social relationships (Nowicka 2006: 78). However, as mentioned earlier, there are limitations how often and in how many places this feeling of home can be reproduced. The feeling of truly belonging is a process that takes time and effort and the ability endlessly replicate it, is not as easy as spending time in a location. (Bude & Dürrschmidt 2010: 492).

5.3 Homelessness as a source of identity

After a while, when the novelty of a mobile lifestyle has worn off and voluntarily homeless has become more of a chore than a source of excitement, the transition back to a sedentary lifestyle is still not always easy. In the majority of the interviews I did, was present the dual feeling of wanting to have a home and uncertainty of being able to "stay put". I recognise the feeling of freedom and power that comes with the ability to travel and to be a "global citizen". At the same time, the need to belong is ever-present. When I asked if my interviewees were concerned about settling down, a typical answer was very similar to the one below.

"Yes. This is a huge concern. I have lived a nomadic life essentially since I was 18. In my current position I have much less leave than I did on other boats, but we are a lot more stagnant and I am somewhat stuck here. As I have no control of the location that we are based, I find myself in areas that I am forced to live but would not choose to if given the chance. The longing to be somewhere else and different is very prevalent and I am worried that it's not a factor of maybe being in an area I don't want to be but, rather having less freedom to travel and becoming bored of the norm." (Courtney, 29)

Courtney's response is pertinent in two ways: it shows clearly how her nomadic lifestyle is still connected to places and even though she is longing for a home she has an urge to be on the road. She is not in charge of her own location but instead it is dictated by her work and this is something that bothers her. Avery

similar quote comes from Jacqui who has worked on boats for fourteen years now. “I think the crux of the matter is that although I joke about being ‘homeless’ the idea of staying in one place fills me with dread!” Both Courtney and Jacqui talk extensively about their longing for a home and how it is something they think about on a daily basis, but at the same time, the idea of a drastic lifestyle change from constantly moving and being “on the road” to a more stagnant lifestyle, is something they struggle with. Being homeless has become a huge part of their identity. As much as I have been longing for a more stable lifestyle and having a fixed home, now that I have started taking steps towards it, I found myself struggling. The idea that I cannot come and go as I please, but instead would be tied to a fulltime job, in a single location, is starting to feel extremely overwhelming. For the majority of the past ten years, I have worked, on average, seven to eight months of the year, maximum. Last year I worked for six months, this year, so far three. The rest of my time, I have been able to travel and spend time wherever I choose. Most of the time, my flights are one-way tickets and making plans for more than couple of weeks ahead feels daunting. A change in lifestyle does not only mean having different routines and surroundings but it has a profound impact on how I see myself and my own narrative. Hence, I find myself thinking: “one more gig, one more year, think of all the money you could save, so when you finally do settle down, at least you will have some money to travel”. To give up my nomadic identity is harder to give up than I expected. For yachties, like for other life-style migrants (for example Butcher 2009; Kannisto 2016; Nowica 2006), nationality or citizenship is not the first port of call when it comes to identity. Due to the proliferation of mobility, identity is no longer mainly derived from a single location (Kaufmann 2003: 8). On the contrary, national identity is interlinked with the traveller identity. Identity formation and with that, the sense of community, has become increasingly de-territorialised (Gupta & Ferguson 1992: 9). Identity formation is a process that is tightly interlinked with globalisation processes and movement (Dawson & Rapport 1998: 3). Using the root metaphor, instead of being held down by strong, sturdy roots, our lives are now merely built on a flimsy rhizome. Identity is not something that is automatically given to us; it is a search that is conceived of space time fluidities (Dawson & Rapport 1988: 4). In my interviews, when asked each person if they identify with their nationality,

the most common answer was that yes, nationality still plays a part but that their identity as some who travels all the time plays even bigger part. Similar identifications can be found amongst groups that live in exile or nomadic groups such as Gypsies. For example, Jewish belonging is often not built on the 'reality' of their home but instead, on shared narratives of homelessness (Olwig 1998: 235) and Gypsy identity is not negated by staying put in one place for a longer period of time (Kabachnik 2012). It is important to note, however, that unlike with nomads who actively seek location-independence (see Kannisto 2016), yachties rarely strive for that. Instead, travelling and moving around is a part of the occupation lifestyle, not a statement made against the way world is organised into nation-states.

When I talked with Ben about his perception of home, he often mentioned the ability to take part in past time activities that he loves, such as surfing, kite surfing and diving. Knowing places where he likes to eat, drink or hang out with friends is the key to feeling at home for him. Through these activities he actively generates a personal history with a place which then, in return, creates a sense of belonging to a certain physical location. In other words, home for Ben is tightly interlinked with his identity. Home for him is not where he is but *who* he is. Even though Ben's friends and family are scattered all around the globe and he does not have an apartment or a house that he calls home, the activities he loves doing act as an anchoring point for his identity and thus create a sense of belonging. The network of places where he can lead the type of lifestyle he enjoys, is the key to feeling comfortable and familiar in multiple locations that might differ significantly from each other. These locations become spaces that are defined by networks (Nowicka 2006: 223). Each location is not important because of its special characteristics but, instead, by its similarity with other places. Spending time in certain locations on regular intervals transforms these places into nodes that together form his networks of homes. Dovey (1984: 42) writes: "Home is a place where our identity is continually evoked through connections with the past". Or in other words: home is where one knows oneself best (Dawson & Rapport

1998: 9). So, for Ben, Jacqui, Theresa and myself, giving up the travelling lifestyle would be giving up a huge part of our identity and, hence, it is difficult to do.

5.4 The ambivalence of returning

This constant push and pull between yearning-for-home and the need to keep a certain narrative about ourselves alive, often results in fragmented life histories. I have a lot of friends who, just like myself, have talked for years about giving up the yachting lifestyle and returning to “normal life”. However, the nomadic identity that we have created for ourselves, has proven to be hard to give up. Our identities are transfixed in the fluidity and mobility of our lives. Often mobility is an aspiration and an opportunity that is taken gladly, but at the same time it is a burden to the individual (Nowica 2006: 111). The balance between options and obligations, resistance and surrender, or inclusion and exclusion is not a zero-sum game. Instead, the life of highly mobile people is a constant balancing act between the two (for example Amit-Talai 1998; Butcher 2009). Dürrschmidt (2016: 506) calls this elective re-embedding ‘transculison’. Unless a person fully commits to either lifestyle, being perpetually without a dwelling place or without re-grounding oneself in one location, the feeling of being “out of tune” or “out of place” will not subside (Dürrschmidt 2016: 507). In a way, for many, transnational lifestyle is a liminal state of being.

One of the reasons for this discrepancy, I believe, is the difference between reality and the aspiration. When home is no longer a single place, it turns into an idea. This way the gap between “real” and “aspired” often widens. In other words, home has a normative dimension that entails the feelings of security, belonging and comfort (Boccagni 2016: 7-8) that does not necessarily have anything to do with the real, lived lives that happen in homes. Hege Høyer Leivestad has studied people who live in caravans either permanently or seasonally. Even though the vast majority of caravans or mobile homes never move, it is the potential for mobility and the freedom of being able to move that is important for the people living in caravans (Leivestad 2018). Dreams, ideals and fantasies of a “good life”

are projected into mobile caravan living, even though they are rarely turned into reality. I can see parallels between the caravan dwellers projections of potential mobility and freedom and the dreams that yachties have of rootedness and being grounded. As much as Leivestad's subjects very rarely move, people who have worked in the yachting industry and have not had a stable home for years, struggle when they finally try and go back to a more location bound lifestyle. In both cases the reality and the aspiration do not match and hence, it is easier to dream about making a difference than actually make it.

"All constructions of home – both symbolical and material ones – reflect predominant expectations about what feeling at home entails, and what a proper home should look like" (Boccagni 2015: 15).

I remember the excitement that I felt when I bought my apartment in Spain. I was elevated by the idea that I would be finally able to be "at home". After a year or so, when I still did not feel like I was truly home, I started to get anxious again. The disappointment I felt when the reality and my aspirations did not meet was so deep that instead of being patient, I left again. As Boccagni brings forward in the following paragraph, home and mobility are not two opposing ways to be in the world, but instead are constructions that are in dialectic relationship with one another.

"--- it should be noticed that the dialectic between being-away from-home and searching-for-it-again has meaningful implications, as well as relevant costs for those involved. In practice, it invites us to investigate the evolving balance between the fixed and the mobile dimensions of the home experience, its real and desired (or ideal) facets, as well as between its material and immaterial foundations" (Boccagni 2015:19).

Another disappointment occurred when I moved back to Finland. I had already been planning to stop sailing as a career for a couple of years and I was excited about it. I had high hopes of moving back to Finland and starting a “normal life”. After having spent so much time away, Finland could not offer me anymore the sensation of belonging. Jörg Dürrschmidt who has studied the anxieties and coping methods of people who after years of extensive travelling and living abroad return home. Dürrschmidt expresses nicely the feeling of being trapped between the two worlds: “Put into the more general context of the dynamics of dis-embedding and re-embedding, the notion of being ‘no longer at ease’ could then refer to lost certainties in terms of life conduct amid uprooted social relations, shaken beliefs and world views” (Dürrschmidt 2016: 498). Occasionally, this yearning-for-home, almost a nostalgic feeling can be directed towards a place we have no prior ties with. This is the case with Courtney. She dreams about living in Gabon. She has no family ties to the country and has only spent three months there. When I asked her, why does she feel so strongly about the place, she could not really answer. In her mind, she had created this ideal place where one day she could move to and build the life that she yearns for. This building up of a dream about the perfect “next step” is not uncommon in the narratives of mobile people. Amit-Talai’s (1998) account of expatriates living in the Cayman Islands tells a similar story. After having spent some time in the Caymans, they no longer wanted to stay, but returning to the country of their origin was not an option either. Instead, finding the next location was the only alternative and so the cycle of mobility and searching continues.

6 Home in different space frameworks

To theorise home, we have to look at different space frameworks it exists in. With a gross simplification, we can say that ‘home’ exists in three different space contexts. Firstly, we can understand home as a physical dwelling place, such as a house or an apartment, with clear boundaries. Second level is a community or a locality, which is connected to the notion of homemaking. The last context is the nation-state and theories of citizenship. As Gupta (2003: 331) mentions, the

processes that position people as citizens of nations but also as members of diversely spatialised, partly overlapping or non-overlapping communities, need to be conceptualised and set in context. In the following chapters I will discuss these three frameworks by using anthropological theories combined with other social and human sciences together with examples from my own fieldwork.

6.1 Home as a dwelling place

In the Western tradition, home is often equated with a house. Something with physical boundaries that makes us feel secure and gives us a sense of privacy (Jackson 1995: 84; Urry 200, 131-133). A dwelling place can be a house, an apartment, a cabin or even a tent, but what is important here, is the connection to physical objects. By using objects, people abolish the distance between themselves and the things they use. Thus, a spatial relationship is created. In this world, objects form a coherent totality in which every object has a proper place in spatial and practical terms (Gray 2003: 232-233). The more people have created connections, not only human connections, but connections to material artefacts, the more difficult it is to travel and spend long periods of time away (Nowicka 2006: 113). To dwell implies a relationship with a man and a physical reality. Hence, home as a dwelling place cannot refer to a purely abstract feeling of belonging (Gray 2003: 232-233). I am not suggesting that dwelling refers purely to the physical quality of a place. On the contrary, Martin Heidegger's idea of dwelling is closely connected to the way humans exist on earth. He writes: "We do not dwell because we have built, but we build and have built because we dwell, that is, because we are dwellers (Heidegger 1978: 246). According to him the plight of dwelling is not about the lack of housing but the continuous search for its essence. In other words, a dwelling is much more than a place where one sleeps (Heidegger 2011: 241-255). Even though the idea of dwelling contains much more than a physical quality of a home, my attempt is to show through the following examples, that the physicality plays a great part in determining the concept of home. The approach that brings attention to the view that home is not a synonym to a house is called the "home/housing binary (Boccagni 2016: 4).

Theresa who has worked on boats for the past three years writes: “The ship that I work on is my home and it makes it easy to always give 200%. I feel like the ship is my home, so I invest more than just my working time to keep it clean, neat and in good condition”. Despite this comment, her need to have a more permanent physical home becomes apparent later in her story. She writes how she enjoys travelling and not being in a fixed location but struggled when she was having a rough time and did not have a home to go to. After her parents passed away, she decided to rent a small apartment in Germany, where she is from, in order to keep her permanent residency.

“To my tiny room in Bremen, I travel around 3 times a year to change working clothes according to the area I sail in. But having that room changed a lot. I am more chilled out, I know I am not depending on the hospitality of my friends, I know my stuff is safe and all gathered in one place and I can enjoy shopping for souvenirs again, because I know there is a place, I can put it in. As I just came back home in my tiny little room today, I got to admit the feeling is unbelievably good. I can go somewhere; I know where I belong if I am not on board and I know where to go for having a rest and being myself and surrounded by a place which is designed by me and "smells" like me. Compared to the ships, where I often move cabin and always are in tidy and unpersonal cabins where is forbidden to hang up a shelf or pictures.” (Theresa, 27)

The feeling of home and the connection to her place in Bremen, does not stem from a community or a personal history in that place. Instead, it stems from its physical quality to offer a place to rest. It is a place where she knows the physicality of the objects intimately. As she describes, she even recognises its’ smell. It is a personal space of physical safety both for her and for her belongings. It is the physicality of this particular place that is important for Theresa. My close friend Belinda simply states: “Home is where I have all my belongings in one place, and I have made it my space of comfort”. I have worked and travelled with Belinda multiple times over the years, and the whole time I have known her, she has not had a fixed address. Regardless, she keeps buying things for her future,

imaginary home. When we were together in Egypt, she wanted to find a traditional Egyptian lantern. Laughing, she told me how she has collected enough items to furnish a huge house. At the moment, these items are scattered around the world between friends' and family's houses and storage units, but she dreams about having a home one day where she can put all these things. When I asked more about why these objects were important to her, she explained to me that by buying these things, she reminds herself that she does not want to be homeless forever. Also, when she finally settles down, it will not take her a long time to create the feeling of her own home. She will have all these things around her that will remind me of where she has been and what she has done. This way she can bring her history with her, wherever she decides to settle. Thus, objects for her are not cold, meaningless artefacts but, instead, a connection to her identity and past.

Another important aspect of Theresa's earlier account is the feeling that she has, that she can always return to her room without needing to consult or ask for permission from anyone else. The knowledge of having a physical space that you can retreat to without being dependent on anyone else, was a recurring theme in the interviews. A physical place is not enough to make you feel like home if you do not have control over its borders. These boundaries are demarcated both physically and symbolically (Dovey 1984: 36). It also implies closure: the homeowner decides who can come in and who has to stay out (Castles & Davidson 2000: 130). This is the paradox of the fluid world: the increase in movement and freeing up of restrictive boundaries, has been accompanied with increasing particularism (Dawson & Rapport 1998: 9). In the world of mobilities and fluidity, a fixed physical place of home remains to have its significance (Bagnall et al. 2004: 22).

In the yachting world, this need to be in control of the boundaries is often not met. On a boat, the amount of privacy or the ability to be in a closed, private space that you control the access to, is very limited. When on land, a typical accommodation is a shared house with your crew that is paid for by the boat

owner or staying with friends. Even if a person stays in an apartment for an extended period of time, she/he needs to feel like she/he is in control. This becomes acutely apparent in Elsa's story:

"I have been working 1.5 year for the same boat with my boyfriend. During the winter yard period in La Ciotat we were, with the crew, in a very nice apartment that was paid by the boss. I had my bedroom with ensuite bathroom that I shared with my boyfriend, I was cooking in a cosy apartment every day, and the crew was coming back for lunch, it was nice. I was going to Pilates, going to the market, I had some of my best friends in Marseille, etc. I was feeling home. I was even feeling so much like home that I decided, after spending Christmas with my family, to go back to La Ciotat for New Year's Eve and have a chilled one, maybe even inviting a friend over. But what I didn't know was that my captain had been kicked out by his wife from England, and he was already getting drunk with some friends of his at the apartment (that I had left super clean and was already all messed up). So, instead of a chilled holiday, I ended up being locked up in my room trying to avoid some drunken English sailors. That is when I understood that all of that was just an illusion of a "home", and even if I had to pay (which we were not used to anymore), I needed my own home!"

She goes on telling how, after that experience, she finally decided to rent a place together with her boyfriend so that they could feel at home somewhere. But even now those boundaries are compromised.

"We are in the last floor here, there is only our apartment with a nice terrace. And it seems that the owner is trying to sell the building. So, they make visits to the building at least once a week, and always come in to our flat to show the terrace. The real estate agent was always coming (before I complained) without asking me before hand, ringing at the door, and when I opened, her, her dog and 5 or 6 guys were entering just to visit the flat. Once is OK but every week or more drove me crazy. I felt I always had to be ready (I don't like to open the door if I look like

I have just gotten out of the bed and haven't cleaned.) Anyway, one day she rung the bell... It was 11am and I was still working on my computer from bed. I didn't open the door... Then I heard her coming into my flat!! My home for which I am paying an indecent price for every month in order to finally have my own place! I kicked her out straight away. I hate the idea that she has my keys, the keys of this boundary…"

Both of her accounts show how important the ability to control borders is. In this sense 'home' is a perfect example of Law and Mol's region typology. Like in Theresa's example in which she explains how she has gathered all her belongings in a small room where she knows they are safe. Even though she visits that place only on rare occasions, it is a physical place she controls and, thus, it is her 'home'. Or like in Elsa's case, she is struggling to feel at home anywhere since the lack of being able to control the border and determine who comes in and who stays out. "So, it's possible to build a version of the social in which space is exclusive. Neat divisions, no overlap. Here or there, each place is located at one side of a boundary. It is thus that an 'inside' and an 'outside' are created" (Law & Mol 1994: 647).

The creation of a homeplace, has often been described by writers who examine how racial power differences generate spaces, where the subaltern group needs to actively construct a private and safe place. A homeplace becomes a site for resistance. It is a place to return to for protection from discrimination or violence (bell hooks 1990: 42; Castles & Davidson 2000: 132). The destruction of physical homes has for a long time been a way to control and dominate used by the groups in power. This is an indication that a home does not hold power only as a symbolic idea but also as a physical place.

"It is no accident that this homeplace, as fragile and as transitional as it may be, a makeshift shed, a small bit of earth where one rests, is always subject to violation and destruction. For when people no longer have space to construct

homeplace, we cannot build a meaningful community of resistance" (bell hooks 1990: 47).

The idea of resistance is part of place-making, which is a spatial extension of home-building. Place-making is (unlike home-building) a highly visible process through which ethnic groups partially reshape their neighbourhoods (Castles & Davidson 2000: 131). This distinction between home-building and place-making is crucial in understanding the meaning of home for an "elite homeless". The people who work in the yachting industry are by no means oppressed or struggling for rights. There is no collective action of resistance. Instead, home-building is a highly individual, yet important, quest for a private space.

6.2 Home as a community

The second framework of home is community. Very simply put "home is where one feels a sense of belonging and security, and where one can decide on acceptable values and forms of behaviour" (Casles & Davidson 2000: 130). The term 'community' is highly ambiguous and can be understood in multiple ways. It has been criticised to be too vague and broad but still it persists both in everyday language and in academic writing (Amit & Rapport 2002: 13). In the earlier chapter, I briefly explained what I mean when I refer to the yachting industry and the people who work in it as a community. In this section, my aim is not to provide a cross-section of all the different theories of community but to define how the notion of community can be understood through the lens of 'home'.

In the era of globalisation, the way we understand and theorise community is constantly being contested. This does not imply that the importance of community has declined. Instead, the crisis' in solidarity and belonging, which has been exacerbated by globalisation, has increased the need of communities (Delantly 2003: 1-2). It is the idea of community as a culturally homogenic and spatially bounded group with clear borders and location, that has become under a lot of criticism in the field of anthropology (Gupta & Feguson 1992: 2001). Already in

the 1960's and 1970's anthropologists such as Fredrik Barth, Ward Goodenough and Ulf Hannerz were questioning how the boundaries of communities are created in social sciences and how much they reflect reality (Amit & Rapport 2002: 16). So, when Benedict Andersson published his book about national identity as imagined community in 1983, it was not the first time that community as a bound entity was questioned. Nevertheless, Andersson's work became highly influential and has shaped the idea of community as a set of shared cognitive and symbolic structures instead of lived spaces with social intimacy (Delantly 2003: 3). Instead of applying the term community to a relatively small, spatially bound group of people, Anderson based his theory on the notion of "imagined community". Even though Anderson's theory was based around nation as an imagined community, it has been widely adopted in social sciences to describe other kinds of societies as well. The imagined communities that derive from ethnicity, religion, race, nation or gender focus on things that separate people from one another instead of on things that unite. Seen this way, community is defined through a lens of 'us' versus 'them'. But what happens when these categories can be no longer applied to large groups of people? When people are constantly on the move, these boundaries become blurred and who is "us" and who is "them" is not easy to determine anymore. Especially when people are becoming increasingly mobile, home and the community that we belong to cannot be taken for granted anymore. Following Andersson's idea of imagined communities, Arjun Appadurai has emphasised the importance of new media in the creation of communities. The idea of community is no longer based on actual face-to-face interaction between people but created through networks and mass media (Amit & Rapport 2002: 17-18). From this point of view, communities are not dependent on physical propinquity but instead on our presence in the cyber space. Not everyone agrees with this idea that physical contact can be replaced with virtual contact. In fact, territoriality still plays a key role for social relationships (Bagnall et al. 2004: 19). Now that we have moved on from the narrow ideas of a location bound cultures as communities, the importance of place has started to interest social scientists again. As Vered Amit (2002: 36-37) puts it: "We may be willing to acknowledge that the people we are studying are moving, but their moves are insistently framed within fields which

bear more than a little resemblance to a familiar representation of peoplehood that we have spent a lot of time criticizing as far too bounded, continuous and internally articulated".

Ascribed categorical identities seldomly bypass the actual social relationships and contacts. During my interviews not one person mentioned ethnicity, race or religion when asked about feelings of belonging and community. Some of the people I talked to said that they do feel a sense of community within the yachting industry whereas others dismissed that notion. In my interviews both Willo and Ben talked about the importance of the online yachting community they feel like they belong to. Even though these communities are maintained through the internet, they were originally born in face-to-face situations and require at least sporadic physical reinforcement. The online side of the community did not come up in the interviews with anyone else than Ben and Willo. Unlike Andersson (1991) suggests, it is the personal connection and physical contact with people, rather than purely an imagined idea about community that their feeling of belonging is built on. I do not disagree with the idea that communities can be created and maintained without physical proximity, however, I do not believe that a community in a sense of 'home' can be fully detached from place or from intimate relations. There is no doubt that online communities play a role in the lives of highly mobile people. However, their everyday lives are still strongly grounded in their local communities (Andreotti et al. 2012: 56; Escobar 2001: 140).

Physical propinquity can no longer be the presupposition for community, but location and physical closeness nevertheless play a key role in their formation, especially if we examine them from the perspective of home and belonging. However, the feeling of home or belonging is not only reserved for places to which we have prior ties with, even though these ties are often actively upheld. Instead, the feeling of belonging is an active process of building connections and histories through personal experiences and by linking a place to a biographical life history

(Bagnall et al. 2004: 38). This is called ‘home-building’ (Casles & Davidson 2000: 131).

According to Hage, the sense of community is one of the four building blocks that are part of the home-building. The other three are: the feeling of security, familiarity and sense of possibility (Hage 1997 in Casles & Davidson 2000: 131). Thus, a group, a family unit or an individual has to create a personal spatial and temporal existence in a location in order to call it a home (Urry 2000: 131). This kind of homemaking has been explicitly present within migrant communities when a new sense of home is actively created through physical representations, cultural symbols and material goods (Casles & Davidson 2000: 131; Urry 200: 140-141). The rules of homes often reflect the rules of society: what kind of behaviour is expected and appropriate, the way that homes are used, the times and places of entering, who are allowed to enter and so forth (Werner et al. 1985: 3). Thus, a home can be a community in itself and a part of one. Home can be understood as an unmoving centre, a single fixed point around which one builds his/her life around. Traditionally, that has been understood as a concrete location that is situated within a “culture” or a society and is environmentally fixed. However, there has been an academic sift in how homes are understood, due to increased mobility (Dawson & Rapport 1998: 21).

“Funnily, this feels like home to me now (Antigua) but purely because I have friends around, I’ve got the activities that I do, I know all the places around here. --- So, for me it’s a lot of the time spent in a place that makes it feel like home.” (Ben, 30)

As the above example from Ben above shows, the feeling of community needs to be actively maintained in order for it to stay active. If the basis of consociation is removed, the feeling of community cannot be viable on its own (Amit & Rapport 2002: 62). The example also shows how much emphasis is put on people you

feel close to and on personal histories that are associated with places. Movement does not erode the need for belonging or for personal connection.

When we talk about community, it is important to distinguish it from other forms of human collectives such as social groups and networks. According to Amit & Rapport networks are ego-based social connections that arise through particular individuals' efforts, experiences and history. Social groups on the other hand are based on institutional or communal mobilisation and do not depend on any one individual. Both, networks and social groups, overlap and mix with communities and thus lines between them are often blurred. The danger of this is that we start confusing category (network) with collectivity (social group) and do not realise that personal, as opposed to categorical, relationships require contact, reciprocity, opportunity and effort. (Amit & Rapport 2002: 22-23).

As mentioned earlier, the notion of home is very personal and how we create a sense of community varies significant even amongst the yachties. Alec has been a good friend of mine for years and even though he spends the majority of his time away from his rented house in Newport, Long Island, that is undoubtedly his home. Unlike many other yachties, Alec made the decision right in the beginning, when he started his career on yachts, that he would always keep a "home base" in Newport. Over the years I have known him, I often questioned his decision to keep paying rent for a place that he hardly stays in, but for him it was not a question of choice. Alec went through a tough time in his early twenties and was kicked out of home. This led to a period of homelessness that had a long-lasting effect on his views about home and community. For Alec, the monetary loss of paying fulltime rent is insignificant compared to the psychological benefits it gives to him. Unlike Ben, Alec travels back whenever he has a chance. Being away has not diminished his sense of belonging or community. Instead, Alec starts to feel anxious after spending long periods of time away, and often makes the effort to go home even if it is for couple days. The difference between Ben and Alec are the actual time spent in their country of origin and how they project their futures onto that place. Ben, who cannot picture himself moving back to Australia,

at least not any time soon, has stopped actively recreating that sense of belonging in Australia, whereas Alec who has been adamant about keeping his connection to Newport active, has not lost his sense of belonging and community.

Unlike for many transnational professionals, whose work-related networks are totally separate from their personal life sphere, in yachting, work and free time are often tightly intertwined. This assists in the feeling of belonging without being rooted in a specific location. Often yachties date other yachties since maintaining a relationship with someone who is tied to a location and does not understand the requirements of the job, can be challenging. Having a romantic relationship with someone from the yachting community often increases the feeling of belonging and thus negates some of the negative feelings that arise from not belonging anywhere. I asked Belinda, who has been longing for a home for years, if her attitude has altered now that she has started a serious relationship with someone from the yachting community. She replied: “I suppose it has. I now look at Willo as my home, for now wherever he is living with his work, I am living too. Therefore, calling it “home”. We are also working on a future plan to buy a house to call our home.” I was not surprised by Belinda’s answer since I had detected a change in her demeanour in the past few months. Whereas before she seemed anxious to find a place where to settle in, lately she had seemed more relaxed about it. The feeling of being homeless had dissipated through having a relationship that she feels secure and comfortable in, without her needing to settle down in a single location permanently.

Reading Hege Høyer Leivestad’s account of British and Swedish caravanners, it becomes apparent that the community that they find in campsites, is a big part of their allure. The ostensible freedom and the feeling of community are the repeated reasons of choosing to dwell permanently or semi-permanently in a caravan (Leivestad 2018: 84, 139). The feeling of belonging does not necessarily stem from being location bound but, instead, for the people in these places. Through these examples, I hope I have been able to show that the idea that local loses its significance and is replaced by global or that community can be purely

imagined, is not evident in highly mobile people's lives. Instead there are new ways of establishing communities in which globalising social relations accentuate localised communal identities (Bagnall et al. 2004: 17).

6.3 Home as a nation

"It was an odd experience arriving home, and thinking about home, when I had been living away from my native country for so many years", writes Jackson (1995: 6) in his book about what home means to the Australian Aboriginals. Even though Jackson has not lived in his native Australia for years, he still calls it home. Like in Jackson's example, the notion of home is tightly intervened with the discourse of nation-state (Casles & Davidson 2000: 130). The question "Where are you from?" is normally answered with a name of a country or a town. Even if a person has not lived in that place for a long time, that is how we often identify ourselves. The same feelings of familiarity, security and control, that are associated with a physical dwelling place, are replicated in the homeland-home equation (Boccagni 2015: 93). Nowicka notes that as well as the territorial connection with home and a country of origin, homeland encompasses two other dimensions: phycological and biographic-temporal (Nowicka 2006: 172). I will add to these three aspects a fourth one: political/legal aspect. In order to untangle the multiple different aspects of home, it is important to note the difference between home as concrete set of socio-political rights and obligations and as more personal and abstract entity (Olwig 1998: 235). Since, the world is still organised primarily through nation-states and citizenship, we often see home and belonging through this lens. In my own experience, it is difficult to feel a full sense of belonging somewhere if you are not included in its socio-political sphere. I will discuss the biographic-temporal aspect in the next chapter in which I expand on the other temporal aspects of home and will focus on the spatial and political/legal aspects of the home-homeland discourse in this chapter.

For the first time in history, the vast majority of people are governed by nation-states instead of, for example, by monarchs or dictators. Thus, most people in the world are classified as citizens (Castles 2005: 352). As citizenship has become one of the main ways to determine one's identity and legality, migration pushes people to be politically and culturally homeless. Immigration and uprooting from one's homeland often mean a precarious political existence (Arnold 2004: 18, 130). Even though yachties do not often suffer from exclusion and marginalisation to the same level as immigrants that come from more precarious situations, they stay on the fringes of the societies they live in and suffer from a place detachment. In the current citizenship discourse, it has become central to understand the role of the interplay between different borders, whether physical or symbolic, and how the international system of states is a part of a supranational governmental regime that creates new forms of belonging (Balibar 2004; Ong 2003; Stevenson 2003). The attempt to separate citizenship from the state has proven to be an extremely difficult task despite the way that global transformations of politics, economy and culture have been explored in various ways by theorists of globalisation (Hansen, Stepputat & Hansen 2005: 10). Even though there are differences between how states organise their citizenship, cultural norms and governmental institutions constrict the way citizenship is organised around the world (Shanahan 1999: 68-69). By conflating home/homeland with nation or culture, the root metaphor re-enforces the idea of a coherent, territorialised culture. This idea is reinforced through historical writing. The history of the world is equated with the history of states (Nail 2015: 4). As a citizen, a person is an autonomous, unitary subject that is free of conflict and tension. Homelessness is not only a precarious state of being, but it strips a person of his/her right to be a politically complete entity (Arnold 2004: 4). To be a citizen is "common sense" (Castles 2005: 352). The idea that a home is a set of concrete socio-economic rights and obligations needs to be validated and reinforced through personal narratives and symbolic expressions among interacting individuals (Olwig 1998: 235).

Citizenship is the primary, and some argue, the only way to exist as a 'full person' in today's world. This, however, does not mean that citizenship is an unchanging concept. Some of the elements of citizenship that were once taken for granted, such as its connection to nation-state, are now being contested and re-articulated (Ong 2006: 499). Globalisation and the changes in the meaning of social space create new ways to organise ourselves. Transnational communities: groups with regular and significant activities in two or more countries, are constantly contesting the boundaries of nation-states and belonging (Castles 2005: 356). The fluidity and diversity of how people move, locate and re-locate themselves has started to interest researchers with increasing intensity (Ahmed et al. 2003: 3). However, my attempt here is not to delve too deeply into the different conversations about citizenship and transnational communities. I am more interested in the personal feeling of belonging and home building than in the legal and practical aspects of the problems that yachties face when they spend very little time in the country, they are citizens of.

The problem with deterritorialisation is not the fact that people move and have multiple place-attachments. Problems arise because of the disparity between people's lifestyles and the way world is politically organised. In practice, it is extremely difficult not to have a permanent residency anywhere. "Citizenship entitlements, social security provisions, pension benefits, rights of residence and, most particularly, migration is still more often predicated on national models of stable employment and populations than of deterritorialization" (Amit-Talai 1998: 52). Migration or mobility are seen as temporary ways of being whereas place-attachment is the primary point of reference. This mentality leads to a perception that a migrant is somehow a failed citizen (Nail 2105: 3). Liisa Malkki has studied how the refugees of the Second World War were theorised. She found that often their disconnection from their roots was entangled with the idea of losing their moral bearings. The world has changed dramatically since the end of the World War II but "the refugee" is still seen not only as a political problem but as a moral problem. The act of uprooting is seen as chaotic and unorganised. It leaves the person without roots, not connected to anything. Malkki (1992: 32-33) argues that

“our sedentarist assumptions about attachment to place leads us to define displacement not as a fact about sociopolitical context, but rather as an inner, pathological condition of the displaced”. So, perhaps the feeling of being out of place or not belonging, is not due to our need to have a solid, locally fixed home, but instead, it is something we are constantly being told that we need and that we are somehow lesser members of society if we do not have. We are told that rootlessness is a condition we must avoid and thus we are increasingly worried about losing our sense of belonging.

Interestingly, Malkki (1992: 31) sees a significant difference in place-attachment between the migrants and the mobile elite, ie. expatriates. At the other end of the spectrum is “the expatriate”, who neatly and tidily pick up their roots and transplant them to a “foreign soil” as easily as they picked them up. I agree with Malkki, that there are a lot of ways that the movement of people is treated differently depending on their status, but I do not agree with the notion that the expatriate moving of roots is as easy and uncomplicated as Malkki presents. Maike Fechter (2007), who has studied expatriates in Jakarta, points out how the expatriates’ community situates itself completely outside the Indonesian society. The expatriates themselves used metaphors such as “bubble” and “bunker” to describe the closed off community they lived in. Fechter (2007: 47) describes “living in a bubble” as “--- a colourful, but fragile existence; one that is carefully created like a soap bubble, floating above the ground, and not touching the earth”. Sawa Kurotani’s (2007) work on Japanese expatriate housewives lives in America points to similar findings; even though they integrate more closely to the American society than the epat’s in Jakarta, they have no notion of having roots in America. Neither of these ethnographic accounts show any evidence of that expatriates “pick up their roots in an orderly manner from the “mother country,” the originative culture-bed, and set about their “acclimatisation” in the “foreign environment” or on “foreign soil” – again, in an orderly manner”, as Malkki (1992: 31) claims. Instead, like in Fechter’s and Kurotani’s research, my own experiences indicate that once roots have been picked up, whether voluntarily or involuntarily, they are very hard to be put back down. And even if they are re-

planted, it does not mean that they start growing in new soil. Very much in the same way that Malkki describes what happens to the refugees, yachties often do not have a strong connection to any single place. Instead, they live in their own "bubbles" that are not connected to the surrounding societies. From this point of view, physical mobility might lead to a narrowing of social connections and restricted social mobility. Remaining in "bubbles" and not connecting with one's geographical surroundings, may lead to disintegration and disorientation of individuals. So, interestingly physical mobility may become a burden and reason for social immobility (Nowicka 2006: 33).

Even though, often, the roots that mobile people have in their country of origin, remain the only ones, the perception of the "homeland" changes as time passes. "Home" as a nation, especially if the person has left that place some time ago, becomes more of an idea than in an actual physical place.

"I am at times embarrassed of the perception people abroad have of Americans. In some cases, I feel it is warranted – in others, quite unfair. As a result, I go through phases of feeling deeply connected with my American roots. And then other times where Americanism feels more foreign than the global identity I have come to embrace over the years. I do deeply identify, though, with the moral imperatives I consider to be so intrinsically American: ideas of freedom, democracy, justice, and independence." (Nikki, 25)

This quote form Nikki is a good example of how the root metaphor reinforces the patriotic ideals of a homeland. I have noticed how my feelings towards Finland have changed over the years. The more time I spend abroad, the more idealistic Finland becomes in my mind. Whenever I am asked about Finland, I extol its greatness and bypass all the characteristics that bothered me about Finland when I lived there, despite the fact that the idea of moving permanently back to Finland distresses me. The root metaphor also strengthens the nation as a source of identity rhetoric.

Our nationality is often seen as a label and a connection between people. However, after the initial connection, nationality rarely determines friendships even in multicultural work environments. Instead, it is the shared experiences of mobility and excessive travelling, that are often more important (Nowicka 2006: 155-173). I had noticed this tendency amongst my friends, and my feeling got verified in my interviews: none of the people I talked to and interviewed, admitted that they actively sought the company of their fellow countrymen. I asked the question as part of every interview and every time it was met with almost a surprised reaction that I would even consider that. Some of my interviewees dismissed the question saying that it is irrelevant to them, and some of them admitted that if anything, they try to avoid the company of their countrymen.

"No, if I'm not in France, I would even say that I usually try to avoid French people as I'm usually trying to learn the language and culture of the place where I am." (Elsa, 34)

More often, friendships with people who had stayed "back home" and had never lived abroad, were seen more problematic. This is one of the reasons why Belinda doubts she will ever move back to Australia. "All my friends (in Australia) have partners, houses, children… When I am there, it's great to see them and they make an effort because they know it is only for a short time. Whereas in reality, if I was to move back there, we live completely different lifestyles and I doubt we would have much in common and would not make an effort in the long run."

Hence, national identity appears to be more about the feeling of being rooted to the past and to one's homeland as a nostalgic feeling, instead of an active pursuit of creating a community that consists of people with the same nationality and cultural background. It is part of person's individual biography (Nowicka 2006: 173) and it is meaningful in that sense, but it is not a determining factor in the sense of belonging. Whether one is actively looking into the past or into the future is, according to Boccagni (2015: 83), a fundamental distinction of how actively

homeland is re-created. He divides the approaches into exilic and diasporic orientation. In exilic orientation, the focus is on the past roots of a physical place, whereas in diasporic orientation, the focus is to re-construct some features but not to re-establish a past national essence. Within the yachting community, neither of these perspectives are present. This is due to the nature of a yachtie's homelessness. It is voluntary and those who leave, leave on their own not with a family or a community. Most yachties still have their families and close friends in the country of their origin. Whenever they start missing their homeland, they just simply travel back to visit it, instead of being economically limited to be able to do that. Hence, the familiarity of the past can be revisited and there is no need for active re-creating whilst "on the road". The identity of a 'global citizen' co-exists with the national identity. This is not to say that identification with nationality did not always coincide with the feeling of belonging or notion of home, like I presented in the previous chapter. However, the feeling of not belonging, that many of my friends and interviewees share with me, when we do travel 'back home' is problematic.

7 Temporality of home

During my writing process, I constantly reflected my own feelings about home, and I wondered why I do not feel fully at home in Helsinki. Why am I still missing a sense of belonging? If I follow the criteria, of what constitutes a home, that I have set above, Helsinki is no doubt my home. I identify myself as Finnish - it is not the only way I identify, but it is an important one. If I am to give a brief description who I am, being Finnish is high on that list. I have never been a citizen of any other country, I have been domiciled in other countries, but this does not mean that I have ever felt Spanish, English or Australian, or have ever considered giving up my Finnish citizenship. I also feel a sense of community in Helsinki. I have a lot of friends, who I have known for years, some even decades, who still live in Helsinki. I feel a cultural affinity to Finnish culture, and I have a sense that this is "where I am from". I even have a physical home in Helsinki. It is an apartment where I used to live, before I took up professional sailing. Even though

none of my furniture is there anymore and I leave very little personal objects behind, it still is a place in which I control the boarders and feel that it gives me a physical place of safety.

So, what is missing? I was communicating with one of my interviewees and she was explaining to me how it is difficult for her to define home. She wrote: “Sometimes I think home is a place where I can live, sometimes I think home is people I decided to be with (boyfriend, children), sometimes I feel home is just my roots (my parents place).” I pondered her answer and started to understand not only the spatial but the temporal aspect of home.

7.1 Time and space

Time and space are often conceptualised as inherently opposing entities. Phenomena are seen either as spatial or temporal. Traditionally space has been seen as static, closed and immobile whereas time is dynamic and (often) progressive. However, the relationship between time and space is much more complicated than that. This is not to say that time and space are the same but that they are interconnected and the effect one has over the other should be noted and examined (Massey 2005: 17-19). The increased focus on the spatial aspects of societies, in other words, the ‘spatial turn’, has led to a situation where social phenomena are emptied of their temporal dimensions. Putting an emphasis on the omnipresent nature of communication and connectivity that new technologies provide us with, our life is compressed into “here and now” (Bude & Dürrschmidt 2010: 483). However, the ‘spatial turn’ -approach never implied that space was *more* important than time, only that it was its *equal* (Arias & Warf 2009: 3-4). Thus, to fully understand the concept of home, we must look at its temporal aspect as well. How much people feel “at home” when living on a boat, within the sailing community or when travelling back to their country of origin, depends heavily on how they situate themselves on a temporal continuum within those places and the memories they have created. A historical connection to a place is not enough to explain the feeling of belonging or not belonging, instead, it is a

question of personal life trajectories. This is what, I realised, was lacking in my initial analysis. Home is arguably located in place and space, but to fully understand it, we have to examine its temporal qualities too.

Another aspect in considering time and mobility for yachties is the fact that their moving around is perpetual. It is not an anomaly in their life but instead the norm. Moving around and being "on the road", which in itself is a very dynamic way of existing, becomes a permanent state of being and, thus, in a way mobility becomes a static part of the yachties' lifestyle. As I described in chapter four, the rhythm of yachtie's life is determined by the time spent in meaningful places and around people that are close to us. Time is not a continuous element but, instead, consists of blocks that have a very different intensity to them. Between the meaningful periods, there are the periods that have no biographical importance. Time spent in non-places becomes non-time. I am not arguing that time does not have a similar aspect to those who are sedentary but let me try and explain how I believe it differs.

Whenever I travel back to Finland, I know it will only be for a few weeks, so I try to fit as much as possible into those weeks. Often, a friend would say that if we do not manage to find a time to meet during the week in question, we will meet up some other time. This type of response would always annoy me. I wanted to ask them how they did not realise that there would not be "some other time". Even though my friends knew that I was only staying in Finland temporarily, their idea of time is vastly different to mine. For them time has a long-term quality; if something did not happen this week, you could always make it happen the next. Whereas for me, time has a very different essence; it consists of blocks that are not connected to each other.

7.2 Past, present and future

According to Bauman (1998: 88), as geographical location loses its meaning, time changes its meaning as well. As space shrinks and physical propinquity becomes less meaningful, the flow of time is abolished: everything happens in the present. “The inhabitants of the first world live in a perpetual present, going through a succession of episodes hygienically insulated from their past as well as their future” (Bauman 1988: 88). I agree with Bauman in a sense that when physical mobility is in abundance, and I can connect with friends and family instantly via the internet, time loses some of its meaning. However, even though I do agree with the notion that mobile people often spend a lot of time in places where their past, present and future does not meet (Nowicka 2007: 71), I do not agree that the life of mobilities is insulated from their past or present or that time becomes meaningless. If anything, I would argue that the past and the future are even more pressing matters for highly mobile people than for people who live more sedentary lifestyles. The feeling of being separated from the past and future, creates a longing for them. As I explained in the previous chapter, time, as well as space, can be divided into meaningful and unmeaningful interludes. Many of my yachtie friends, myself included, are constantly trying to position ourselves on our temporal continuum. It is like living in a liminal state, where you have to mirror your present constantly with your past and your future. In their ethnographic study of home design and ways of dwelling Bhamra et al. (20017: 27) write:

“When we set participants’ understandings of the home within the context of a discussion of temporality, it becomes clear that past-present-future are closely intertwined in people’s projects of home. These research insights enable us to see how participants’ understandings of their realities and the possibilities for action they have within them can be situated through the idea of ongoing change, but that their future imaginaries for their homes might be located in a range of different ways in relation to the present, and in relation to whether or not their realization is realistic or not”.

A similar kind of past-present-future continuum could be found in the reflections of home through my own research as well. The more I talked to people, the more apparent it became that the notion of home is a temporal trajectory. Reading studies about migrants' home making process' (for example Boccagni 2015), I learnt that home as a personal experience is shaped by time. Ben, as mentioned before, feels very much at home living on the boat and in a few different yachting hubs around the world. When I asked Ben if he misses home, he seemed puzzled, for him the boat was home and he did not actively think about the issue. Ben's reply was very different to a lot of the others I talked to, but so was the way he imagines his future. Unlike many of his fellow yachties, Ben does not actively think about having "a life after yachting". Instead, Ben sees working and living on yachts as his future. He has no interest in returning to Australia, nor is he actively planning on having a family and giving up his travelling lifestyle. He mentions that: "Obviously if the right girl came along, things can change but right now, no, I don't really even think about it that often and it's not on my priority list". The way Ben talks about his past, present and future, is the key to understanding why different people in similar situations feel very differently about being homeless. The roots Ben had in Australia have been picked up and he is not grounded to his native country anymore, he has no sentimental longing for going "back home". His past does not evoke the feeling of belonging. Future for Ben is very much connected to his present; he does not see his current situation as an interlude on his life trajectory. When there is no longing for the past or the future one can feel at home in the present.

7.3 Yearning for home and nostalgia

Those who I interviewed that were the most bothered by their homelessness, were the ones who were actively planning a life after yachting. Belinda, my Australian friend, who does not feel at home when going back to Australia is a good example of this. She sees her career in yachting coming to an end soon and thus the feeling of homelessness was weighing heavily on her. It was not the fact that she does not enjoy traveling, but since she is determined to start building a more sedentary life for herself, she needs to pick a place to start the next

chapter of her life. Having to turn her aspiration of a home into a reality is causing her anxiety. Not only for immigrants, but for any highly mobile group of people the idea of a home is an idealised version of how we remember our past homes or as we project these memories onto the future (Boccagni 2015: 66). As we have already concluded, spaces are places that are socially and personally constructed, and memory is a big part of this process. Memories can be both personal and collective and as much as they create places, places help to form memories. Thus, their relationship is multidimensional, and it is futile and unproductive to try and divorce space from time (Cresswell 2014: 119-120).

Even though we can never go back in time, 'home' represents the circularity of our lives. It is the place where we set out from and return to, even if not physically, in spirit (Dawson & Rapport 1998: 9). Thus, the primary meaning of 'home' implicitly refers to the search for a home (Boccagni 2015: 68). It is about nostalgia and 'going back'. It is an idea of time and place in our lives that we feel familiarity and connection to (Massey 2005: 124). Homesickness and longing to the place where we grew up is typical amongst those who have left their country of origin (Jansson 2016: 429). The need to 'go back home' is associated with the familiarity and comfort we feel towards a certain place. This feeling can be obtained only over time but once it is reached it is an experience of total *insidness* (Dovey 1984: 37).

Since we can never go back in time, the discrepancy between our fantasies of home and the actual reality of it, often have negative implications. When home is not an effectively experienced way of being but purely a procrastination, it loses its ability to be a source of security, familiarity and control, but instead, turns into a source of anxiety and confusion. This idea of 'returning home' implicitly brings forth the assumption that while the 'mobile' and 'transnational' leave and travel, when they return, they return to an immobile and grounded reality of those who have never left (Ahmed et al. 2003: 3; Massey 2005: 124). This assumption is clearly naïve. However, it is carved in the dichotomy of home versus mobilisation, or mobile versus sedentary. In reality, both the homecomer and the ones who

have stayed put, have moved forward. Coming home is, thus, not primarily experienced through space but through time (Bude & Dürrschmidt 2010: 493).

The realisation of not belonging anymore when a person returns to their home country, having lived abroad for years, comes as a shock for many. Elsa's account of how she feels about her native France and the idealistic view of being 'international', is not unique amongst other yachties. As Elsa writes:

"Before, when I was younger, I really wished I would have lived in another country as I thought I spent enough time in France (I never travelled when I was a kid and really missed it) and I always thought it would be super cool to become "international" and to live somewhere else. Now that this is happening, I understand it is not so easy and it's hard sometimes to find one's own identity... Here (Spain), of course I'm a stranger, but there (France), after being away for so long, I don't know if I can say I belong there anymore." (Elsa, 34)

Jörg Dürrschmidt's account of travellers who, after years of living abroad return to their home country and find themselves struggling because of the difference that exists between their nostalgic memories of the 'home' they are returning to and the reality they are facing, paints a similar picture.

"Unlike the 'stranger', who expects to encounter the unfamiliar, the 'homecomer' faces the daunting insight that he will never again be fully part of the unquestioned familiarity that makes the quality of what used to be 'his' social milieu" (Dürrschmidt 2016: 496).

The idea that 'home' is our past, is difficult to shake (see for example Butcher 2009). These examples show how the conceptualisation of time as progressive and dynamic and space as static and constrained, is too simplified. The spatiality of home can be very dynamic and fluid whereas the temporality of a home is more

static. What I mean by this is that ‘home’, in its essence, is not about a location or even about space. Instead, it is a fluid topology. The essence of home stays the same and does not dissipate even when we move houses, relocate ourselves to different cities and countries or constantly move around. This does not mean that our idea of home does not change. Our dreams about the type of house we want to live in, who we share our ‘home’ with and how much time we spend at home are a few examples of how our idea of home changes with time. However, this does not mean that the essence of home changes even if its location and construction changes. Thus, a home can never be just a location. As much as it needs to be a physical place, it needs the temporal aspect as well. If the location does not have the temporal trajectory to past and to future, it will not fulfil the requirements of ‘home’. Instead, the space will be solely a dwelling place, not a home.

8 Conclusion

As Augé (1995: 109) writes: “--- in the world of supermodernity people are always, and never, at home---“. Once uprooted, the “homecoming” will never be uncomplicated. The aim of this thesis was to look closer at what the ostensibly straight forward claim “to be rooted is a basic human need” means. My aim has been to show that word pairs such as belonging-uprootedness, mobility-immobility, place-space and local-global should not be understood as mutually exclusive binary opposites. That ‘home’ is not a one-dimensional place of dwelling nor can it be understood as purely an abstract entity either. Instead, homes are created in different spheres of space and time and always, on some level, connected to a physical place/places.

A lot of ink has been spilled over conversations of place attachment and how it is affected by globalisation. The ‘spatial turn’ that started in the late 1980’s has turned the gaze of social and human scientists from human agency and time to space and its construction. No longer are place and space taken for granted as unchangeable backgrounds onto which humans build their lives. Instead, space

and place are now understood as constructed and as dynamic as time is. The 'spatial turn' happened simultaneously with the proliferation of globalisation and mobility theories, pushing the conversation towards the fluid nature of the modern world. This, in turn, has led to overemphasising of movement and disconnection from places. Despite the criticism of location bounded cultures and the proliferation of mobility theories, anthropologists have remained defenders of the understanding the importance of place (Escobar 2001: 147). This has been the aim of my work as well: to show that the everyday life is still connected to locations. Everyone I interviewed for this thesis is chronically mobile meaning that they cannot pinpoint one single location where they spend most of their time. However, this does not mean that locations are not important for them. On the contrary, the search for the perfect location, in other words, for their home is ongoing.

More than just general place connectedness, I was interested in the concept of home and how its meaning changes once you do not have one anymore, from the perspective of highly mobile people. My aim has been to show how the extreme mobile elites long for a home and the feeling of belonging and how it affects their identities. Even though highly mobile people move and locate themselves within different cultures and countries often, home does not need to be constructed anew each time a person changes his/her location, nor does geographical proximity automatically determine the boundaries of belonging (Nowicka 2006: 149). I first started by dividing home into three different spaces entities which were: home as a dwelling place, community and nation. Developing these themes, I realised that homelessness and its connection to our identity formed a huge part of my material and, thus, deserved its own chapter. As I went on, I realised I had made the same mistake as so many, who use place connectedness as their main theoretical framework; I had ignored the temporal aspect of home formation. Including that aspect into my work, I felt that the concept of home finally started to make real sense to me. I hope this comes through in the end. To summarise: 'home' is a synthesis that encapsulates our spatial-temporal way of being in the world.

As this thesis is partly autoethnographic, I have used my own experiences as ethnographic material. Autoethnography, despite it becoming more popular in the recent years, is still not very common in anthropological writing. Thus, I felt it to be important for me to look into the different autoethnography methods and the main critique of it. As it is not such a common methodological approach, I felt I was taking a risk using my own experiences as extensively as I have done. However, I feel that even if I had not openly used them, they would have affected my writing process and it would have been misleading to portray myself as an outsider or as an anthropology student that is only studying a phenomenon that interests her. By sharing my own experiences, which I feel represent the feeling of many other yachties, I was able to develop my thesis further than I would have been able to otherwise.

As I mentioned earlier, this thesis did not take into account any gendered bias If there had been more room and time, it would have been interesting to interview more people and see if their approach to ‘home’ varies depending on their gender. Also, having a theoretical angle, which looks time and place from gendered perspective could have given more depth to the subject. Another interesting topic to continue would be to see what happens to all those who I interviewed in years to come. Will they be able to settle down and find the home they so much long for or will they again after a couple of years, move on. Which will prevail in the long run: the need for a steady home or the need to be on the road.

References

Adams, T. E.; Holman Jones, S.; Ellis, C. (2015): Autoethnography. New York, (NY): Oxford University Press.

Ahmed, S.; Castañeda, C.; Fortier, A-M.; Sheller, M. (2003): Introduction: Uprootings/Regroundings: Questions of Home and Migration. in Ahmed, S. Uprootings/Regroundings: Questions of Home and Migration. New York: Berg.

Amit-Talai, V. (1998): Risky Hiatuses and the Limits of Social Imagination: Expatriacy in the Cayman Islands. In Dawson, A. & Rapport, N. (edit). Migrants of Identity: Perceptions of Home in a World of Movement. Oxford: Berg.

Anderson, B. (1991): Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism. Rev. ed. London: Verso.

Anderson, L. (2016): Analytic Autoethnography. Journal of contemporary ethnography 35.4: 373–395.

Amit, V. (2007): Structures and Dispositions of Travel and Movement. In Amit, V. Going First Class? New Approaches to Privileged Travel and Movement. New York: Berghahn Books.

Arias, S & Warf, B. (2009): Introduction: The Reinsertion of Space into the Social Sciences and humanities. In Arias, S & Warf, B. (edit). The Spatial Turn: Interdisciplinary Perspectives. London: Routledge.

Atkinson, P. (2016): “Rescuing Autoethnography.” Journal of contemporary ethnography 35.4: 400–404.

Augé, M. (1995): Non-places. Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity. London: Verso.

Bagnall, G.; Longhurst, B. & Savage, M. (2004): Globalization and Belonging. SAGE Publications. Retrieved from https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.libproxy.helsinki.fi/lib/helsinki-ebooks/detail.action?docID=254646

Balibar, E. (2004): We, the People of Europe? Reflections on Transnational Citizenship. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bauman, Z. (1998): Globalization. The Human Consequences. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bhamra, T; Mackley, K. L.; Morosanu, R.; Mitchell, V. & Pink, S. (2017): Making Homes: Ethnography and Design. Retrieved from https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.libproxy.helsinki.fi

Beck, U. (2000): What Is Globalization? Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bisharat, G. E. (1997): Exile to Compatriot: Transformations in the Social Identity of Palestinian Refugees in the West Bank. In Ferguson, J. & Gupta, A. (edt.). Culture, power, place: Explorations in critical anthropology. Durham (NC): Duke university press.

Bochner, A. & Ellis, C. (2006): Analyzing Analytic Autoethnography: An Autopsy. Journal of Contemporary Ethnography 35.4: 429–449.

Bochner, A. & Ellis, C. (2016): Evocative Autoethnography: Writing Lives and Telling Stories. New York: Routledge.

Boccagni, P. (2016): Migration and the Search for Home: Mapping Domestic Space in Migrants' Everyday Lives. Palgrave Macmillan. Retrieved from ProQuest Ebook Central, https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.libproxy.helsinki.fi/lib/helsinki-ebooks/detail.action?docID=4731247.

Buchli, V. & Cox, R. (2017): Series preface: Why home? In Bhamra, T; Mackley, K. L.; Morosanu, R.; Mitchell, V. & Pink, S. (2017): Making Homes: Ethnography and Design. Retrieved from https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.libproxy.helsinki.fi

Bude, H. & Dürrschmidt, J. (2010): What's wrong with globalization? Contra 'flow speak' - towards an existential turn in the theory of globalization. European Journal of Social Theory, 13(4), 481–500.

Butcher, M. (2010): "From 'fish Out of Water' to 'fitting in': The Challenge of Re-placing Home in a Mobile World." Population space and place 16.1: 23–36.

Castree, N.; Kitchin, R. & Rogers, A. (2013): A Dictionary of Human Geography. 1st ed. Oxford, Eng: Oxford University Press.

Candea, M. (2007): Arbitrary Locations: In Defence of the Bounded Field-Site. The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute 13.1: 167–184.

Castles, S. & Davidson, A. (2000): Citizenship and migration: Globalization and the Politics of Belonging. London: Macmillan.

Chang, H.; Hernandez, K-A. & Wambura Ngunjiri, F. (2014): Collaborative Autoethnography. Walnut Creek, Calif: Left Coast Press.

Clifford, J. (1997): Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press.

Cresswell, T. (2014): Place: An Introduction. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated. Retrieved from ProQuest Ebook Central, https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.libproxy.helsinki.fi/lib/helsinki-ebooks/detail.action?docID=1780033.

Dawson, A. & Rapport, N. (1998): Home and Movement: A Polemic. In Dawson, A. & Rapport, N. (edit) Migrants of Identity: Perceptions of Home in a World of Movement. Oxford: Berg

Dawson, A. & Rapport, N. (1998): The Topic and the Book. In Dawson, A. & Rapport, N. Migrants of Identity: Perceptions of Home in a World of Movement. Oxford: Berg.

Delanty, G. (2003): Community. London: Routledge.

Deleuze, G. & Guttari, F. (2010 [1986]): Nomadology. In Lemert, C. C. (edit). Globalization: A Reader. London; New York: Routledge.

Dovey, K. (1985): Home and Homelessness. In Altman, I. & Werner C. M. (edit). Home Environments. New York: Plenum Press.

Dürrschmidt, J. (2016): The Irresolvable Unease About Be-Longing: Exploring Globalized Dynamics of Homecoming. European Journal of Cultural Studies19.5: 495–510.

Fechter, M. (2007): Living in a Bubble: Expatriates' Transnational Spaces. In Amit, V. Going First Class? New Approaches to Privileged Travel and Movement. New York: Berghahn Books.

Ferguson, J. & Gupta, A. (1992): Beyond "Culture": Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference. In Ferguson, J. & Gupta, A. (edit). Space, identity and the politics of difference. Washington (DC): American Anthropological Association.

Ferguson, J., Gupta, A. (1997): Culutre, power, place: explorations in critical anthropology. Durham (NC): Duke university press.

Gupta, A. (2003): The Song of the Nonaligned World: Transnational Identities and the Reinscription of Space in Late Capitalism. In Lawrence-Zuniga, D. & Low, S. M. (edit). The Anthropology of Space and Place: Locating Culture. Oxford: Blackwell.

Gray, J. (2003): Open Spaces and Dwelling Places: Being at Home on Hill Farms in the Scottish Boarders. In Lawrence-Zuniga, D. & Low, S. M. (edit). The Anthropology of Space and Place: Locating Culture. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hansen, T. B., Stepputat, F., & Hansen, T. B. B. (edit). (2005): Sovereign Bodies: Citizens, Migrants, and States in the Postcolonial World. Retrieved from https://ebookcentral.proquest.com

Hastrup, K. & Olwig, K. (1997): Siting Culture: The Shifting Anthropological Object. London: Routledge.

Heidegger, M., Krell, D. F. & Garman, T. (2011): Basic writings: From Being and Time (1927) to the Task on Thinking (1964) (repr.). London: Routledge.

hooks, bell (1990): Yearning: Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics. Boston Massachusetts: South End Press.

Jackson, M. (1995): At Home in the World. Durham: Duke University Press.

Jansson, A. (2016): Mobile Elites: Understanding the Ambiguous Lifeworlds of Sojourners, Dwellers and Homecomers. European Journal of Cultural Studies19.5 (2016): 421–434.

Law, J. & Mol, A. (1994): Regions, Networks and Fluids: Anaemia and Social Topology. Social Studies of Science 24, 641–71.

Leivestad, H. H. (2018): Caravans: Lives on Wheels in Contemporary Europe. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Kabachnik, P. (2012): Nomads and Mobile Places: Disentangling Place, Space and Mobility. Identities (Yverdon, Switzerland) 19.2: 210–228.

Kannisto, P. (2016): Extreme Mobilities: Challenging the Concept of 'travel. Annals of tourism research 57: 220–233.

Kaufmann, V. (2003): Re-Thinking Mobility: Contemporary Sociology. Taylor & Francis Group. Retrieved from ProQuest Ebook Central, https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.libproxy.helsinki.fi/lib/helsinki-ebooks/detail.action?docID=4817647.

Kümin, B. & Usborne, C. (2013): At Home and in the Workplace: A Historical Introduction to the "Spatial Turn". *History and Theory, 52*(3), 305-318.

Kurotani, S. (2007) Middle-Class Japanese Housewives and the Experience of Transnational Mobility. In Amit, V. Going First Class? New Approaches to Privileged Travel and Movement. New York: Berghahn Books.

Malkki, L. (1992): National Geographic: The Rooting of Peoples and the Territorialization of National Identity Among Scholars and Refugees. In Ferguson, J. & Gupta, A. (edt). Space, identity and the politics of difference. Washington (DC): American Anthropological Association.

Massey, D (2005): For Space. London: SAGE.

Marcus, G. E. (1995): Ethnography In/of the World System: The Emergence of Multi-Sited Ethnography. Annual review of anthropology 24.1: 95–117. Web.

Moore, H. L. (2004): Global Anxieties: Concept-Metaphors and Pre-Theoretical Commitments in Anthropology. Anthropological Theory 4.1: 71–88.

Nail, T. (2015): The Figure of the Migrant. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Nowicka, M. (2006): Transnational Professionals and Their Cosmopolitan Universes. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag-

Nowicka, M. (2007): Mobile Locations: Construction of Home in a Group of Mobile Transnational Professionals. Global networks (Oxford) 7.1: 69–86.

Olwig, K. F. (1998): Epilogue: Contested Homes: Home-making and the Making of Anthropology. In Dawson, A. & Rapport, N. (edit.) Migrants of Identity: Perceptions of Home in a World of Movement. Oxford: Berg.

Ong, A. (2003): Buddha is Hiding: Refugees, Citizenship, the New America. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ong, A. (2006): Mutations in Citizenship. Theory, Culture & Society. Vol. 23(2-3): 449-531.

Scott, S. (2009): Making Sense of Everyday Life. Cambridge, UK: Polity. Retrieved from http://search.ebscohost.com.libproxy.helsinki.fi/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=575138&site=ehost-live&scope=site.

Shanahan, S. (1999): Scripted Debates: Twentieth-Century Immigration and Citizenship Policy in Great Britain, Ireland, and the United States. In Hanagan, M. & Tilly, C. (edit). Extending Citizenship, Reconfiguring States. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Solent University, Southampton. (2020): Superyachts. Retrieved from https://maritime.solent.ac.uk/maritime-industry/superyachts. (Accessed 10 March 2020).

Stevenson, N. (2003). Cultural citizenship: Cosmopolitan questions. Retrieved from https://ebookcentral.proquest.com

Superyacht. (2020): Wikipedia. Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Superyacht. (Accessed: 10 March 2020).

Urry, J. (2000): Sociology beyond societies. Mobilities for the twenty-first century. London: Routledge

Urry, J. (2007): Mobilities. Cambridge: Polity Press.